

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XX. No. 23 }
WHOLE No. 517 }

MARCH 15, 1919

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR }

Chronicle

The War.—Early in the morning of March 4, Senator Lodge, minority leader in the Senate, offered a resolution in the Senate to reject the League of Nations as now

The Lodge Resolution

drafted, and urging the Paris Peace Conference to sign the peace treaty as soon as possible as the first important step in the settlement of the problems now facing the world. On objection of Senator Martin (Dem.) the resolution was not received, but Senator Lodge was permitted to read it as well as the names of the thirty-seven Republican Senators who signed the round-robin pledging their support in opposition to the League. These thirty-seven Senators will be members of the next Congress, and will constitute more than one-third of the Senate which must ratify any treaty by a two-thirds vote before it becomes effective. The more prominent of these Senators were Henry C. Lodge of Massachusetts, Philander C. Knox of Pennsylvania, Lawrence G. Sherman of Illinois, William E. Borah of Idaho, Boies Penrose of Pennsylvania, Hiram W. Johnson of California, Miles Poindexter of Washington, James Wadsworth, Jr., of New York, William M. Calder of New York, and Frank B. Brandegee of Connecticut. The resolution read by Senator Lodge was as follows:

Whereas, under the Constitution it is a function of the Senate to advise and consent to, or dissent from the ratification of any treaty of the United States, and no such treaty can become operative without the consent of the Senate expressed by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators present, and Whereas, Owing to the victory of the arms of the United States and of the nations with whom it is associated, a Peace Conference was convened and is now in session at Paris for the purpose of settling the terms of peace; and, Whereas, A committee of the conference has proposed a constitution for a League of Nations, and the proposal is now before the Peace Conference for its consideration;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Senate of the United States in the discharge of its constitutional duty of advice in regard to treaties, that it is the sense of the Senate that, while it is the sincere desire that the nations of the world should unite to promote peace and general disarmament, the Constitution of the League of Nations in the form now proposed to the Peace Conference should not be accepted by the United States. And be it resolved further, that it is the sense of the Senate that the negotiations on the part of the United States should immediately be directed to the utmost expedition of the urgent business of negotiating peace terms with Germany satisfactory to the United States and the nations with whom the United States is associated in the war against the German Government, and the proposal

for a League of Nations to insure the permanent peace of the world should be then taken up for careful and serious consideration.

In answer to the criticisms made by the Senators with regard to the proposed covenant of the League of Nations, President Wilson at a gathering of nearly 5,000

The President and Mr. Taft on the League

people in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, on the eve of his return to Paris, declared that the first thing he was going to tell the people on the other side of the water was "that an overwhelming majority of the American people is in favor of the League of Nations." "I know," he continued, "that this is true; I have had unmistakable intimations of it from all parts of the country, and the voice rings true in every case." Several parts of the President's speech were similar to the statement made by him in Boston on his return from France and were rather in the light of an appeal for the ideals of the League than an answer to the objections. These objections he left to Mr. Taft, who spoke before him, to answer. Mr. Wilson declared that if the United States did not enter the League, it would be the most contemptible of nations, and that it is not befitting that Americans should set up a policy of "careful selfishness." Speaking of the opponents of the League he added:

I have heard no counsel of generosity in their criticism. I have heard no constructive suggestion. I have heard nothing except "will it not be dangerous for us to help the world?" It would be fatal for us not to help it.

Mr. Taft devoted the greater part of his speech to an analysis of the principal articles of the Constitution of the League. He defended the Constitution from the strongest and the most prevalent objections made against it, namely that Great Britain would dominate the Executive Council, that the Monroe Doctrine was threatened, that many of the provisions of the League Constitution were unconstitutional, because they gave to the Executive Council of the League, powers and functions delegated by the Constitution of the United States to the Congress of the United States. Mr. Taft also dealt with Senator Lodge's resolution calling for immediate peace first and then consideration of the League later on. Though the speaker thought that the Senate would not dare to delay peace by refusing to ratify a peace treaty embodying as an essential part a League covenant, he advised President

Wilson to profit by the constructive portion of Senator Lodge's program and by the fair criticisms of other opponents, and declared that these objections brought against some of the details of the League would help the Conference at Paris in perfecting its final draft.

Alsace-Lorraine.—The disastrous consequences to the Faith to which Alsace-Lorraine is exposed by its reunion with France have been frequently pointed out in

*Perfidious
Laicization*

AMERICA, and occasion was taken to indicate the sinister connotations of the appointment of M. Debierre to the task of studying the question of religion and education in the restored provinces. The misgivings expressed by the intrepid editor of *La Croix*, seem to be in a fair way of realization, according to the article published by M. Jean Guiraud in his issue of February 4, 1919:

M. Debierre, President of the Senatorial sub-commission appointed to study the religious and school question in Alsace-Lorraine, has declared in the *Paris-Midi* and in the *Pays*, that separation between Church and State must at once be proclaimed in our recovered provinces; and we know, without being able to publish the decisive proofs in our possession, that our governors will not recoil from imposing on them the same restraints in the matter of worship and from making the same confiscations of all sorts that we ourselves have suffered.

The same M. Debierre has declared that the school laws which obtain in France must be applied without delay in Alsace-Lorraine, that the teaching body and the educational system must be laicized, and that ministers of religion must be excluded from all public schools. This program which is described as necessary and urgent, it is expected, will go through without very much resistance; and the word adaptation is applied to this perfidious opportunism which has been so successful against us for the past thirty years.

This adaptation has already begun, although our Parliament has passed no legislation whatever on the churches and schools of Alsace. Every day brings us letters from high ecclesiastical authorities in Alsace-Lorraine which point out that the process of laicization is already in progress. In many of the communes ministers of religion, who have been free heretofore to enter the schools at will, are admitted only one day a week; and this day will be suppressed in a short time.

We are informed that already manuals of history and morals, condemned by the Bishops, are being introduced into the Alsatian schools, and this invasion will become more extensive, if it is true, as we have been told, that the Government intends furnishing the school-books to the children of the reconquered provinces.

The perfidy of this procedure is in direct contradiction to the promise made to Alsatians by Marshal Joffre in the beginning of December, 1914, when he said, "France brings to you, together with the liberty which it has always represented, respect for your own liberty, the Alsatian liberty, for your traditions, your convictions, your habits. I am France, you are Alsace, I bring you the kiss of France."

Le Devoir of Montreal points out how odious and impolitic is this program, and to all fair-minded Americans it will no doubt appear that the kiss of France is the kiss of Judas. Without question this new religious persecution will alienate the sympathy of Americans, who love fair-play, and will make them doubt if it is worth while

contributing to the defense of a nation, which plays fast and loose not merely with its promises but with the sacred words of liberty and justice.

Ireland.—Erin has been much in the public eye during the week. On Tuesday night, March 4, the President, after delivering his speech in favor of the League of Nations, in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, finally received the delegation appointed by the Race

*Sympathy for the
Republic*

Convention to present the claims of Ireland. In answer to the request that he look to the rights of Ireland, Mr. Wilson replied that he would give the matter attention when the affair came up in the Conference. This rather perfunctory reply together with the fact that the President refused to interview the committee until one member, to whom he is personally hostile, left, precipitated furious criticism which served to bring Ireland's woes to the attention of people who otherwise would have remained ignorant of them. Both the American and English papers made this interview a topic for editorials. In general the American papers were sympathetic with Ireland's cause, many of them vigorously so. As was to be expected the junker press of Britain was highly indignant at this foreign interference "in a domestic problem." It is interesting to note that De Valera, who has been elected President of the Irish Republic by the National Assembly, cabled to America words of confidence in Mr. Wilson. He has also taken occasion to deny the current story about the manner of his escape from jail, remarking that the reports reflected on the virtue of Irish girls. Moreover, Sean O'Kelly, Sinn Fein Ambassador to the Paris Conference and Dr. McCartan, Sinn Fein Ambassador of the Irish Republic to the United States, both deny the rumor that the Irish in America had been asked or were to be asked to use political influence against the President. Both reports were correctly attributed to British propaganda.

If the attitude of Mr. Wilson left much to be desired, the Irish have no reason of complaint against our legislative bodies. Early in the controversy several of these passed resolutions favoring Ireland's freedom, and during the past week the State Senate of New Hampshire concurred in a resolution passed by the House, urging the President to press Erin's claims, and though Massachusetts had officially spoken before, yet the Democratic members of its House once more memorialized Mr. Wilson on the subject; while, lastly, the national House passed, by a vote of 216 to 41, a resolution favoring Ireland's freedom. This action was considered a friendly and timely warning to Britain by the *Manchester Guardian*. The Irish papers, notably the capable *Dublin Leader*, are not too sanguine of receiving justice from the Peace Conference. However the editor happily remarks that "Ireland and the Irish in America and others than Irish in America, and the Irish and friends of Ireland in Australia and Canada and other parts of the world will

have a say" about Erin's freedom. Undoubtedly the able editor includes Labor amongst Ireland's greatest friends.

Some of the French papers have at last found voice for Erin. *Le Populaire* of Paris recently carried this item:

Of course, in other directions there are "stabs in the back," and one of them was lately delivered by a paper called *Démocratie Nouvelle*, which is severely taken to task by a contemporary, *La Gazette Franco-Britannique*. The latter referred to a paragraph in the *Démocratie Nouvelle*, printed "under the outrageous heading" of "Bolshevism and Sinn Feiners," and describes the few lines as being "as bitter as they are unjust." "Ignorance is an excuse," says *La Gazette*, "but it does not constitute an indisputable right to indulge in falsehoods and slander."

Later still, *La Gazette Franco-Britannique* gave prominence to a long letter in favor of the Irish cause. Commenting on this communication *La Gazette* remarks:

The Irish question is an historical fact which calls for a solution by the same right as many other questions of nationality before the Peace Conference. England is stubborn in her designs, of which Germany knows something. Our faithful friend and ally employs the same spirit of inexorableness in all the domains of her magnificent empire. It is none the less true that the permanent deplorable quarrel which for centuries has engaged her in struggles with Ireland cannot continue for ever without producing serious consequences for her national homogeneity. . . . People must listen to the voice of justice and to the appeals of right. Do you hear on all sides the voices which implore? They come from Poland, Armenia, Catalonia, and from Ireland. It would be dishonest and imprudent to cork one's ears.

The British press does not criticize these items; each time one such appears it contents itself with announcing that some obscure lord or decadent dowager has gone over to the anachronism called Home Rule, a splendid argument for an Irish Republic.

Italy.—The new political party, which has been formed in Italy, and which has its headquarters at Rome, although it is made up principally of Catholics and is supported by some of the most eminent Catholics, is not a Catholic party in the technical sense of the word. It

is called the *Partito Popolare Italiano*; it does not in any way involve ecclesiastical responsibility for any action it may take; both in its "Appeal" and in its "Program," it avoids any mention of the word "Catholic," and membership in it is open to any one who accepts its principles and submits to its discipline. Nevertheless the party is considered a Catholic party, as is clearly shown by the Socialist organ, the *Avanti*: "There are only two parties of action in Italy, we and the Catholics. Very well. Here is the program of the Church. We are ready for the fight." Presumably the choice of a neutral title had behind it something of the motives which led the Catholics of Germany to call their organization the "Center party." At present it has the toleration, not the explicit approval, of the Holy See.

The first steps taken towards the formation of the new party are thus described by the *Irish Catholic*:

There has been, as our readers are aware, no Catholic political party in Italy in the proper sense of the term. Catholics, of course, took part in the political life of the country, but there was no Parliamentary organization among them that could justify the name of a political party. The end of the war and the possibilities of the future, however, made some persons of high political and social standing think of establishing a Catholic party. Meetings were held by Parliamentary deputies by provincial and communal councilors elected by Catholics. Representatives of workmen's organizations joined them. The matter was carefully discussed in all its details, and the result is the formation of a "popular Italian party." A provisional committee elected by the promoters of the plan have issued an appeal and drawn up the party's general program.

The Provisional Committee, which is to remain in charge until the first National Congress, is made up as follows: Giovanni Bertini, Giovanni Bertone, Stefano Cavazzoni, Achille Grandi, Giovanni Grosoli, Giovanni Longinotti, Angelo Mauri, Umberto Merlin, Giulio Rodinò, Carlo Santucci, Luigi Sturzo. They have issued an "Appeal" and a "Program," both of which are briefly summarized by the Roman correspondent of *La Croix* from the *Corriere d'Italia*, in which they were originally published, but the full texts of which are now easily available, for instance in the *Civiltà Cattolica* for February 1, 1919:

They [the members of the party] address themselves to all men of independent views and moral strength, who realize that they are under the obligation in this grave hour of laying aside their own prejudices and prepossessions and of co-operating for the supreme ends of their native land. They commit themselves to the politico-moral program which is the patrimony of Christian nations. In the international order they praise the League of Nations and they ardently devote themselves to the task of procuring a happy future for Italy. In the constitutional field they wish to substitute for the centralized State a State which shall be popular in the true meaning of the word, respecting the natural organisms, the family, the classes, the communes. They demand the reform of parliamentary institutions on the basis of proportional representations, not excluding votes for women, and an elective Senate as the direct representative of natural, academic, administrative and syndical organizations. They desire in addition to other reforms greater decentralization in regional districts.

The party declares the soul of the new society to be the sense of liberty, and consequently of religious liberty, both for individuals and for the Church. It has formulated clearly defined suggestions on the development of labor legislation and economic reforms.

As far as can be ascertained at present, the Holy Father has not committed himself one way or the other concerning the new party. Some have read a sort of tacit approval on his part into the coincidence that at the very time the party was being formed Cardinal Gasparri, on behalf of the Pope, wrote to Count della Torre, the President of the *Unione Popolare*, as follows:

The venerable Pontiff sees with paternal satisfaction a faithful band of devoted collaborators in the Popular Union of the Catholics of Italy. He sees in them a powerful factor of the

religious and moral renewal of the Italian people, and he deigns to grant them a tangible sign of his good-will in the Apostolic Blessing.

But the clear distinction between the *Unione Popolare* and the *Partito Popolare Italiano*, and the fact that the words of the Secretary of State referred only to the former association, have led others of more conservative views to think that in assuming a tacit approval on the part of the Pope, more is read into the Cardinal's words than is warranted by the facts. This view seemed to be supported by the fact that the *Civiltà Cattolica* at first published the "Appeal" and "Program" without a word of comment.

In a subsequent issue, that of February 15, 1919, the *Civiltà Cattolica* published an extended article on the subject, in which it said clearly: "The new *Partito Popolare* is not, in the proper sense of the word, a Catholic party, it does not so call itself, nor can it be given such a title." It added, moreover, that neither the appeal nor the program were submitted for either correction or approval to ecclesiastical authority, and that careful comparison of its tenets with essentially Catholic principles showed that the new party's program was open to the criticism of sinning in part by defect and in part by excess. The *Civiltà Cattolica* does not condemn the new party, but withholds definite and final judgment until the party has shown itself in practice in its real colors, contenting itself in the meantime with pointing out that Catholics are at liberty, but under no obligation, to align themselves with the new element in Italian political life, but that if they choose to do so, it is at their own personal risk.

At any rate the organization of the new party is proceeding rapidly. The Roman Correspondent of the London *Tablet* wrote under the date of January 31, 1919:

The Italian Popular party is organizing itself. From Milan, Turin, Padova, Florence, Naples, come accounts of meetings to that end with the adhesion of all the Catholic associations, and here in Rome, several meetings have been held, and an important one is announced for next Sunday to complete the local organization of the national political association.

Non-Catholic organs on the whole have not shown marked hostility; on the contrary, there has been a more or less general disposition to welcome the party. Catholics are elated over the new departure, insist on the autonomy of the popular party, and are pleased over the fact that they may now openly vote and sit.

Russia.—British refugees who have lately reached England report that the food situation in Russia is "indescribably terrible" as a result of the reign of anarchy

Disease and Starvation Lenin and Trotzky started. The returned travelers say that:

Thousands are dying daily in the great centers of population like Petrograd, Moscow, Kiev, and Odessa. In Petrograd alone the deaths from famine three weeks ago numbered 200 daily. Typhoid or "hunger typhus" is carrying off young and old everywhere, and in Moscow glanders is epidemic. There is no fuel for lighting and millions live in pitch darkness after nightfall.

The troubles of the Russian are further aggravated by lack of coal and wood, which can be obtained only by the very rich or by the favorites and parasites of the Bolshevist Government. The famous Kremlin in Moscow is now used as a hoarding place for wood, fuel, and lighting materials for the Bolshevist Government. The Bolshevist food-distributing system has fallen down and works only to the advantage of the Government and its supporters.

Meat, milk, and vegetables command enormous prices when they can be obtained. Horse meat sells for the normal equivalent of \$10.00 a pound and dog flesh can be had at from \$2.50 to \$3.00 a pound. Cats sell readily at \$3.00 each. In Petrograd a month ago milk was selling for \$5.00 a pint, pork \$30.00 a pound, butter \$45.00 a pound, tea \$125.00 a pound, and potatoes \$3.75 a pound.

It is computed that during December and January nearly 100,000 persons died in Petrograd from hunger and disease.

On a report reaching Rome that the Petrograd Bolsheviki had imprisoned Mgr. de Ropp, the aged and feeble Archbishop of Mohilev, Cardinal Gasparri, in the name of the Pope, sent a wireless dispatch to Lenine urging that the Archbishop be released. Lenine answered that the de Ropp under arrest was the Archbishop's nephew, not his Grace, and promised to order a prompt investigation of the charges made against the young man. He is accused of intriguing to overthrow the Bolshevist Government.

On March 8 Mr. David R. Francis, the American Ambassador to Russia, who returned not long ago from that country, was up before the Senate Committee that has been investigating the rise and progress of Bolshevism in Russia. Ambassador Francis sustained the testimony given by other witnesses regarding the terrorism that prevails there, saying that the horrors reported are true. He maintained that the Bolsheviki represent only about ten per cent of the Russian people, and continued:

They are holding the people in submission with terror enforced by the Red Guard. This Red army is composed in part of Chinamen and Letts and Russians, the latter forced into the service, their wives and children held as hostages to guarantee their loyal service to the Bolsheviki. They pay the soldiers, I am informed, from 200 to 300 rubles a month, and, speaking of money, they are now printing from 50,000,000 to 100,000,000 paper rubles a day, and I am informed that they no longer attempt to keep an account of the amount issued.

All papers opposed to the Bolsheviki, the Ambassador said, have been suppressed. Regarding the disgusting "nationalization of women" he testified that it was true. Though the Central Soviet had issued no such decree, the Provisional Governments had done so. The Central Soviet, however, has made divorce so easy that a mere notice of the dissolution of the contract is enough, and no time limit is set for the duration of the marriage. Mr. Francis corroborated the statements of other witnesses that the most violent Bolshevist agitators in Russia are people from New York's East Side, who left this country in large numbers after the March revolution.

Perishing People, Thriving States

J. C. WALSH

Staff Correspondent of AMERICA

MR. WILSON has secured an agreement that there shall be a League of Nations. He has also extracted at least a provisional agreement that the League shall have some steady work to do; it is to name mandatories for German and Turkish estates in liquidation. This will presently force all concerned to question whether such a program can be worked out through the medium of an alliance of States, the only ideal of a League which has so far made any headway among the delegations. The League is, in fact, in the condition of the thirteen original States when Hamilton took hold of their problem. At that time the Congress consisted of representatives of Virginia, New York, Massachusetts and the other colonies. Settled government was assured only when the people of those States chose directly their representatives to the Congress of the United States.

The morning after Great Britain and Japan had provisionally agreed to Mr. Wilson's terms for the administration of the German colonies, the *Echo de Paris* commented that this course, if persisted in, would precipitate the establishment of a supra-national government, placed above the particular States, despoiling them of their independence, centering on itself the reality of sovereignty, intervening on the local politics of each ally, and subjecting, for example, any measure France might think ought to be taken in regard to Germany, to the prices at which Manchester cotton or Chicago pork might be sold.

It can readily be foreseen whither such debates might lead, if none but the secretly instructed representatives of the various Governments were present. *L'Echo* foresees in such an adventure a France left without alliance in face of her enemy, or enemies. It is considerations of this kind that convince serious students of the difficulties inherent in the League of Nations project, so long as it is restricted to the idea of a concourse of sovereign States. Mr. Wilson has intimated that governments must make way for peoples, but no project for the inclusion of peoples in the plan has yet been put forward by him.

The only project of the kind of which I have been able to learn is one put forward by the Hon. Charles J. Doherty, Minister of Justice of Canada, in a memorandum submitted to Lord Robert Cecil after a comprehensive study of the plans hitherto formulated. Mr. Doherty holds that if the Great Powers insist upon keeping in their own hands the instrumentalities of force, and therefore the reality of executive power, that if under an international convention there is set up the basis of an international judicature, the system will not be complete unless there is a legislature also. Most of the projects contemplate such a body, which they call a Conference, but it would consist of delegates of the Governments. Mr. Doherty believes, on the contrary, that such a body would

be of little use unless it derives its membership and authority directly from the peoples. Its numbers, instead of being restricted, as they must be if those present are to be the confidential agents of only civil Governments and military staffs with secret aims to further, would preferably be extended so as to include direct representation of every national entity. The very fact that the Governments insist on keeping the police and military power in their own hands would tend to enlarge the field in which the influence of the legislative body could be exerted through the medium of investigation, publicity and recommendation.

The author of this plan bases his suggestion fairly and frankly on the plea that men have rights which the sovereign States do not respect, and are exposed to losses which the Governments of States have shown themselves incapable of preventing. He says:

It is the interest not alone and indeed not mainly of the States that hold sway over different sections of people, but the interest of humanity itself, of the peoples of all these States, that demands the prevention of war. To them, therefore, to the governed, belongs a share in the task of ensuring that prevention. The sovereign State is not organized with a view to the exercise of any restraining influence over its own action as towards other States. It is constituted to govern men. It is not its function, either alone or in combination with other States, to govern or restrain itself. If war is to be prevented, or its likelihood to be diminished, that end can be attained only by the existence somewhere, if not of a power that will control, at least of an influence that will restrain the absolute sovereignty of the organized States in their dealings with each other. Whence is that power or influence to be derived if not from the peoples inhabiting the different States, whose every interest demands the suppression of war? They are the sufferers by it, and, if war is averted, it is they who must forego any advantage, real or imagined, which might be hoped for from its successful prosecution. That in their action and in the exercise of their influence exists our main hope of war's disappearance is indicated in almost the concluding words of the very able report of a committee headed by Lord Phillimore: "It is becoming an article of faith widely and sincerely professed in most countries that there is no quarrel between nations for which an equitable settlement could not be found without recourse to war, provided the voice of the people could make itself heard and the necessary machinery were called into existence." No scheme has yet been put forward to provide means whereby the voice of the people, as distinguished from the voices of the different organized States, is to be heard. This is the weak point common to all the schemes I have had the opportunity of examining.

As pointed out by the same committee: "The experience of the present war has brought all thinking people to see that the intricate development of commercial and financial relations has given to all nations, [say, rather the peoples of all nations] a common life." War necessarily dislocates that common life, with results disastrous to all who share in it. The interests affected by war are the interests of the great body made up of the peoples of all the States whose "common life" is by it dis-

turbed. The practical question is therefore how a League can be constituted in which the voice of that great body may be effectively heard and its influence effectively exercised.

If we really mean "to make the world safe for democracy," then the future guardianship of the safety purchased at so great a price must be shared in by a body representative of the world's democracy, whose members have been elected by the direct choice of that democracy. Let the people's interest in the world's peace, which has been so often and may be again placed in jeopardy by the State's action towards other States, be watched over and protected by the world's democracy, the world's peoples acting through their representatives democratically chosen, elected for the purpose by popular vote. Within the body itself, each State or nation would find legitimate protection in the adequate representation therein of its own people. If the Phillimore Committee looks forward, as it does, to "a system of international relations maintained by an aggregate of popular force uniformly intolerant of any attempt to substitute an appeal to the sword for the methods of the council chamber," the hope cannot but be confirmed by the assurance that behind the co-operation of the States, and holding them firmly to it, are the world's peoples speaking and acting through their duly chosen representatives.

In considering the functions which might be assigned to such a body as he thinks to be so necessary, Mr. Doherty premises that the original intention of the League was restricted to "taking steps to avert or prevent war

imminent between States, members of the League or between a member and a non-member State." To this has now been added whatever may be involved in the setting up of mandatory relations towards the empires in liquidation.

Certainly one function of the League should be to exercise in times of peace a constant influence upon the States in their relations with each other, tending to allay those differences which give rise to conflict and make war imminent. In this the role of the popular house, which could not be filled by any of the other agencies suggested, would be to stimulate and reinforce "that sense of mutual obligation and respect for the rights of others which lies at the root of and forms the foundation of those settled rules of conduct among individuals which alone make law and order in the community possible." (Lord Parker, House of Lords, March 19, 1918.)

It would perform that work by investigation, discussion, deliberation and legislation—legislation, however, which would take the form of the adoption of recommendations addressed to the States. These very processes, combined with those necessarily incidental to the election of members, would constitute an invaluable education of all the peoples, and would react to the greatest advantage of the States in their effort to eradicate the occasions of war.

The Inner Circles of Politics and Religion

GEORGE FOSTER

I WAS talking the other day with a young and alert intelligent Socialist writer who retains, as so many Socialists do retain, by a sort of spiritual atavism, a strong, almost yearning inclination toward Christianity. He, like the others who are in his state of mind, is a Socialist because he was educated in a university where he came under the influence of magnetic professors who were Socialists, or, at least, liberals, or radicals; and where he mingled with other young men and young women to whom some form of Socialism, or liberalism, or radicalism, became, and continues to be, an almost spiritual thing: practically the only approximation to religion that most of them knew, or know today. For I think we make a great mistake when we ridicule or sneer at all the young, ardent, muzzy-minded young men and women who follow the red flag madly, or wistfully, or hesitatingly, calling them parlor Socialists and so on. There are, it is true, many who are in such movements merely because it is the fashion among their fellows, or because their shallow and empty minds become inflated with some stray breeze of folly, which carries them away with it. But anyone who has a first-hand, personal acquaintance with young Socialists must realize that a very large number of them find in such movements something that rallies the natural idealism of all human souls; the idealism which, when we are young, lies near the surface of our natures and makes us eager to follow true leaders and righteous causes, but which

will flow toward false leaders and mischievous causes, if our souls lack the light of Catholic Faith, and if we come into contact with those dominating men and women who form the inner circles of all movements, whether for good or for bad.

My young Socialist friend spent a good deal of time in England. He told me of an experience at Oxford University, where he lived for a while. There he met an unassuming, private individual, untitled, of moderate means, of inconspicuous rank; a private tutor only, yet a man who wielded most powerful and far-reaching influence on British political policy, both in domestic and foreign branches, and, therefore, on the affairs of the whole world. For this tutor was the man to whom not several only, but very many of the most powerful leaders of the oligarchy of landowners and capitalists and newspaper proprietors who control the British Empire, came invariably to ask advice, when about to launch a new act of Parliament, or fight a political campaign, or inaugurate a policy. He was recognized as a "great brain"; a man who cared nothing at all for personal publicity, or place, or honor, but who did care enormously for personal power, and exerted it, no doubt, with stark honesty in those directions which he considered best for the welfare of the system which he supported, the oligarchical rule of the British Empire masked in the forms of democracy. He was, in a word, the very center of the innermost of the inner circles in British political life.

Another instance: One of my friends was visiting a certain radical magazine writer one evening in New York. The telephone bell rang. The writer went to the 'phone. It was a long-distance call, from Washington. A well-known Senator was on the wire. The writer was his particular mentor and "political tipster," along radical lines. A bill was coming up on the morrow, and the Senator was appealing to the radical writer for advice. "Hold the wire a minute!" called out the writer, finally; and returning to the room where his wife was talking with my informant, he laid the whole matter before her. She was *his* inner circle of influence, as he was the Senator's. His wife briefly instructed him what to tell the Senator; he did tell the Senator, and the Senator, I suppose, acted or refrained from acting, accordingly. From this inner circle radiated an influence that widened out over the entire nation.

Again: Twenty-four hundred military prisoners in Fort Leavenworth went on strike the other day. They refused to obey the orders of the military officers in command until the officers recognized their "right" to form a committee to represent their interests, and apply the principle of "collective bargaining" to the controversy between them and the authorities. A correspondent for a sociological magazine, the *Survey*, was on the spot, like a war correspondent at the front, and went through the whole extraordinary episode, which ended in the officials recognizing the strikers' committee. I am not at present concerned with the rights and wrongs of this controversy. The point is, that it was hailed by the sociological experts who conduct the *Survey* as "evidencing the increasing articulateness of one of the last great inarticulate groups—the convicted lawbreaker." Another point is of particular interest—namely, that this special reporter of the sociological magazine, who writes an extraordinarily vivid account of the affair, declares that the inarticulateness of the mass of prisoners was apparently unchangeable until two or three *individuals* among them "expressed their mind," and led them in their organization. The most active and eloquent of these individuals was a certain highly educated graduate of Wisconsin University, a convicted pacifist, or "conscientious objector to war," "long the close friend and legal ward of a man very prominent in social work." Another leader was a newspaper reporter and I. W. W. poet. They constituted the inner circles of this movement, which without them would have been abortive or else a mere explosion of mass-madness or mass-wrath.

Is Trotsky or Lenine, either of them, a member of the class to which the world is to be turned over in triumphant Bolshevism: the inarticulate, lowest-class manual worker? Not a bit of it! Both are men of developed intellectual powers, keen thinkers, eloquent writers; both belong to the *intelligentsia*, which the Bolsheviki, led by them, would wipe out.

And now for another straw, hurtling down the winds of wrath and sin and destruction which are blowing

through the world today, a straw from the newspaper report of the evidence given before the Senate committee now investigating Bolshevism in this country. One of the witnesses, testifying to her activities as a publicity agent for Bolshevism—she herself being the wife of an American magazine writer who came to this country as an avowed agent of Trotsky—said that another well-known magazine writer, Lincoln Steffens, came to her from George Creel, asking her to bring *her* influence to bear on Trotsky in order to convince that amiable savior of society of the sincerity of President Wilson! Circles within circles! In certain quarters Lincoln Steffens is credited (or discredited, just as you please), with having written the new Mexican Constitution, by which religion is outlawed from that unhappy country. Wherever and whenever radicalism is fermenting toward an issue, usually an explosion of violence, Lincoln Steffens is at work within the inner circles.

"The true and primary author of it, however," writes Cardinal Newman, referring to the Oxford movement, "as is usual with great motive powers, was out of sight." His words were true not alone of the Oxford movement, but of all movements, democratic ones perhaps most of all. All newspapermen, all politicians, all close observers of the currents of human affairs, know very well that inner circles exist in all planes of society, in all movements of human effort, whether toward the good or toward the bad. Even a Nietzsche, who preaches the "great lonely soul," the superman, the pure individualist, still feels the necessity to proclaim his doctrine; to infect others with his opinions; to proselyte. There are no such things as simple, spontaneous, democratic movements. Nothing is accomplished without the hidden or overt influence of inner circles of leadership or propaganda. Individuals always and everywhere are the motive powers of group action, whether in small things or in great. As in the Catholic Church, you find that great leaders of great movements—popes or bishops or writers—have often been inspired or guided by the advice of recluses, of monks or nuns or mystics, those secret founts of spiritual power, the mediums for the communication of great ideas; so, in the secular world of affairs, you will find that the men and women who remain in the background, the thinkers rather than the doers, are the true molders of opinion, rather than the busy actors in the limelight.

And what a wonderful field for apostleship this sphere of personal, individual influence, the inner circles of real life, opens for the social action of Catholics! How the facts written above cry out the need for the increase of Catholic education of Catholic youth; and the need of ever higher and higher planes of education and culture, so that from *our* centers of knowledge, and of that which is higher and greater than knowledge, namely, sanctity, the inner circles of spiritual and intellectual power may radiate throughout society! What a field for the operations of social-study centers in our schools and colleges, those for girls as well as those for boys! What a

chance for the spreading of Catholic community centers! The old social order has been destroyed. The bad, sad, mad age of soulless profiteering, of money-rotten imperialism, of mammonized materialism, has passed in blood and flame. It may be that something even worse must follow—the return of chaos, of utter anarchy—but certain it is that the old age is gone forever and a new era is in the violence of its birth-throes. And for those who would see the world redeemed by its suffering, and not destroyed, there is one only standard around which to rally, the Cross—the saving value of which once again has been revealed to the world—and there is one only battle-cry, “For Christ!” And we of that side, we who acknowledge the Great Captain, Christ, and His Church, surely should see to it that we overmatch and overpower the sinister influence of the inner circles of confusion and of darkness with our own circles of sanctity, through the power of the saving charity of Our Lord. And if we accomplish this, then, and more and more, will be attracted to the Church not only our own ardent young men and women, but many others who, like the young Socialist of whom I spoke in beginning this paper, only require the positive magnetism of a forward Catholic social movement in order to be irresistibly gathered into the fold.

Protestant Tributes to Irish Catholic Tolerance

ALFRED W. McCANN

WHAT the British imperialists, who do not represent the rank and file of honest Englishmen, attempted when they made use of Sir Edward Carson to spread the impression throughout the world that Ireland, 1910-1919, has been hopelessly divided into hostile factions on a “religious issue,” they nearly accomplished through Sir Edward Carson’s intimate personal friend, Lord Beaverbrook, in another way, in America. These hired agents of imperialism have proved that not only are they not friends of Ireland, but that they are not friends of the United States. Thereby they have incidentally done a great disservice to England.

During the last hundred years, when the Catholics of Ireland stood solidly united behind their great Protestant leaders, Henry Grattan, Wolfe Tone, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Thomas Emmet, Robert Emmet, Smith O’Brien, Thomas Davis, John Mitchel, John Martin, Isaac Butt, Charles Stewart Parnell, it became necessary, in the designs of the imperialists, to smash this unanimity of sentiment and conviction by setting up an artificial irritant. Thus have they always played upon the passions and prejudices of a people approaching unity of purpose, for the openly avowed object of disuniting them.

The outside world must never be permitted to believe that Ireland is united or is capable of being united. Hence, even today, the British propagandists, playing upon the religious prejudices of America, seek at Ireland’s

expense, to make America believe that an independent Ireland would mean persecution of Protestants by Catholics, and that Sinn Feinism is something odious, like Bolshevism or I. W. W.-ism. These propagandists do not tell America that just before the war overwhelmingly Catholic constituencies elected the following Protestant members of the Nationalist party: Swift MacNeill, Samuel Young, William Abraham, Hugh Law, Richard McGhee, Haviland Burke, Stephen Gwynn and Captain Donolan.

Sir Horace Plunkett himself says: “As I have stated publicly more than once, I have never observed that being a Protestant is a disadvantage to a man in Irish public life.” Judge Rentoul, of the Central Criminal and City of London Courts, declares: “English audiences never believe these religious arguments. My very large number of relatives in Ireland are all Protestants. Religious persecution is the very last thing they fear.”

The Rt. Honorable Pirrie, chairman of Harland & Wolff, Ltd., shipbuilders, Belfast, ex-Lord Mayor of Belfast, ex-High Sheriff of County Antrim and County Down, declares:

The records of Irish Catholics show the greatest generosity towards Protestants who are accorded positions of honor and emolument far beyond the ratio to which they are entitled upon any populative basis. I confess with shame that even now the spirit of religious intolerance, although in ever lessening degree, still prevails amongst a portion of the population of Ulster.

General Sir Alfred E. Turner, on the staff of Lord Spencer, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, private secretary to Lord Aberdeen and Commissioner of Police, Counties of Cork, Kerry, Clare and Limerick, says:

I never came across a case of religious intolerance, far less of persecution, on the part of Catholics towards Protestants though I heard of several, which upon investigation proved groundless. There is far more religious animosity on the part of Protestants towards Catholics, and this is the result of the old leaven of Protestant ascendancy which, like all hereditary and inherent consciousness of imagined superiority, dies very hard. The bogey of religious persecution of Ireland is displayed to alarm Protestants, though there is about as much reality in the cry as there is in the mirage of the desert.

The Rt. Honorable Thomas Shillington, linen manufacturer of Belfast and member of the Privy Council, avers:

So far from conducing to the disadvantage of Protestants I am convinced that by granting self-government to Ireland, the Protestant population will be placed in an altogether better and desirable relation toward their fellow-countrymen. It is a great misfortune that religion should be dragged into the service of a political party and be used by it for political purposes. Ireland has been degraded by those who have sought to stimulate and foster to the utmost of their ability among Protestants an aversion towards and a distrust of their Catholic neighbors.

Rt. Honorable Sir David Harrel, ex-Under Secretary of State for Ireland, declares:

I owe it entirely to non-official Catholic friends that I was placed in a position of trust and responsibility. Yet I, a Protestant, have never had anything to recommend me to my Catholic countrymen beyond a deep sympathy for the cheerless, often hopeless, condition of the small tenant farmer.

The Rev. William McKeown, Presbyterian minister, Scots Church, Cork, declares:

In the nineteen years I have lived in Cork I have never experienced and have never known an uncivil or an unfriendly act done by a Catholic to a Protestant on account of his religion. No Protestant who has lived in the South and mingled with the people has any such fear. It is only in Ulster that the people talk of intolerance. In all the cases I have investigated, where it was asserted that men had been dismissed from their employment because they were Protestants, I have never found one such case to be true. The fear of religious persecution in Ireland is a pure bogey invented by politicians.

I am in possession of fifty such statements by Protestants, including Mr. Edward Archdale, Deputy Lieutenant and ex-High Sheriff of Fermanagh and Tyrone Counties; Professor Sir W. F. Barrett, of the Royal College of Science; Walter Kavanagh, ex-M. P. for County Carlow; Sir Samuel Keightley, a leading Ulster Liberal; Sir Hugh Mack, a leading Belfast linen merchant; Rev. W. J. Nelson, an English Episcopal minister who served thirteen years in Ireland; George W. Russell ("A. E."), whose rebuke of Rudyard Kipling's bigotry will ever be remembered; Rev. R. Herbert Sewell, pastor of Great George Street Congregational Church, Liverpool, who has spent years in Ireland; Sir Alexander Shaw, an Episcopalian, ex-President of the Chamber of Commerce, Limerick, and numerous other Presbyterian and Episcopal clergymen. Lord Beaverbrook, "the greatest censor who ever lived," according to Lord Northcliffe, never permitted such statements to filter through to America. The testimony of Lord Dunraven, of Lord Aberdeen, of Sir Edward Grey, himself, in his Plymouth Declaration, December 5, 1911; of Joseph Hocking, all Protestants, is never heard in America.

In the very crisis of the anti-Papal propaganda of 1911 Sir A. Conan Doyle wrote:

There is no more chance of Roman Catholics persecuting Protestants in Ireland than of Protestants persecuting Roman Catholics. In Bavaria the population is enormously Catholic, with a small minority of Protestants. In Saxony the royal family is Catholic. If the Pope has any designs on any country, which has mixed religion, why has he not done something wonderful in Bavaria and Saxony? If he has done nothing there, why would he attempt it in Ireland?

This, from the creator of Sherlock Holmes, should mean more to his admirers than the inventions of a score of propagandists.

Notwithstanding these facts, America was informed as late as February 22, 1919, by John Galsworthy, that Ireland consists of two nations hopelessly divided, one of them insisting that if one of them is free the other cannot possibly be. "But, let us not talk about Ireland," he said, with a sneering ultimatum that neutralized no falsehood. Mr. Galsworthy must know or should know that the "two nations" consist of thirty-two counties, and that but a part of four counties constitutes one of the "two nations" to which he hopelessly refers, whereas twenty-eight counties and parts of the divided four counties, constituting the other nation, convict him of ignorance or malice.

If he were to tell us that an inconsiderable minority of stubborn men, hating freedom and loyal only to their own interests, who have abjectly surrendered to the bogey of political machinations, through which now happily the rest of Ireland clearly sees, are the tools with which Sir Edward Carson operates when he presents to the world the heroic spectacle of himself espousing the cause of "terror-stricken Ulster," his words would look less like propaganda.

Mr. Galsworthy knows that Sir Edward Carson attained his reputation as a lawyer, not in Ulster, but in Leinster, and that after he attained fame he transferred his practice to London, abandoning Ireland altogether, and becoming a member of the English Bar. He knows that Sir Edward Carson not only is not an Ulsterite, but never practised law in Ulster, and that merely because of his strength and reputation he has been used by the imperialists as a figurehead of Ulster-misrepresentation throughout the world, gaining his first unsavory reputation as Crown Prosecutor in coercion trials when Arthur Balfour was Chief Secretary.

Mr. Galsworthy knows, or should know, that when this artificial Ulsterite, Sir Edward Carson, assured the Kaiser back in 1913 that England had her hands full with the Irish question, he then and there consigned the world to war, because in his own defiance of the British Government, backed up by drilled men and arms purchased in Germany and shipped to him from Hamburg on a Danish steamer, he assured the Kaiser that England, disturbed by internal troubles, would not enter the war on the side of France. The conviction will not down, even in England, that had it not been for this mistaken reliance of the Kaiser upon Carson's treasonable conduct and words, Germany would not have provoked the great terror. Ask Asquith what he thinks of Carson. Asquith's letter of December 4, 1916, to Lloyd George does not flatter the great "Ulsterite." Men cannot perpetually be deceived in his regard.

Americans are beginning to look at the facts of 1910, 1912, 1913 and 1914 in chronological order as they involve the "Ulsterite," Sir Edward Carson, who never was an Ulsterite, and his intimate anti-Irish friend, Lord Beaverbrook, and their intimate anti-Irish friend, Lord Northcliffe, junkers and imperialists, all of them. Americans are beginning to appreciate the fact that throughout the war Ireland was calumniated in America and that British statesmen themselves have reprobated these calumnies. Even G. Bernard Shaw, rank materialist that he is, describes the Sinn Fein movement as "noble and exalted." America also is beginning to perceive that throughout the war any American who bore an Irish name, and who sought to refute the anti-Irish calumnies, was at once branded by British propagandists before his American fellow-countrymen as an object of suspicion and as pro-German. British propaganda in America, had it not been for the ardent love Irish-Americans bear for American institutions and their devotion to the land of

their adoption, might well have split the United States into bitter factions, just as it sought to split Ireland.

We Americans of Irish descent and of Irish names have to live with our fellow-Americans and they have to live with us. When one group of Americans is taught by misrepresentation and calumny to look with suspicion upon another group, there is certainly nothing in the process designed to inspire unanimity of feeling, of sentiment, of mutual regard, but on the contrary there is much in it calculated to break down the very spirit of Americanism and to introduce dissension and hostility where all should be union and concord. If English politicians truly loved America, as they now assert, they might have considered the effects of their propaganda at the expense of that large element of America's population of Irish origin that helped to save the British Empire during the last two years.

Dr. Austin O'Malley, a true American, declares: "That I love my wife, America, devotedly does not preclude my love for my mother, Ireland." He is a type of 20,000,000 Americans of Irish descent, who have been embittered by England's campaign of falsehood against Ireland and who, many of them knowing Old World politics more intimately than most Americans do, have been wholly incapable of accepting as sterling England's alleged regard for the freedom of small nations when her conduct toward Ireland, not only in Ireland but in America, has indicted the good faith of her designs.

Love of freedom is the motive that animates all men of Irish origin. Where they see freedom menaced, whether it be in the United States, in Ireland, or in Nigeria, they are ever ready to meet the issue. This is why countless thousands of Irishmen have fought in "the Irish Brigades" of France in all her wars of the century. This is why, by actual count, nearly fifty per cent of Washington's Continental army were Irish, many of them Ulster Protestants. This is why Washington himself issued so many proclamations extolling the service of the Irish in the cause of freedom. This is why the O'Brien regiment, the Walsh regiment, and the Dillon regiment sailed to America from Brest with Lafayette, a fact deleted from many school histories. This is why Irishmen today are more aroused over the question of international freedom than they have ever been. This is why Irishmen, even the persecuted Irishmen whose chief offense seems to be hatred for England, are good Americans, to be counted upon for life and treasure whenever America needs them, and who, for this very reason, remembering Benjamin Franklin's appeal to Ireland for help when the American colonies fought for their freedom, are now determined that Ireland, struggling for freedom before America was discovered, and having given to America the aid America sought, shall not be abandoned when today she calls for America's help.

America has paid her debt to Lafayette, but the statue of John Barry, erected at the doors of Independence Hall, Philadelphia, reminds America that her debt to Ireland

has not yet been paid. On Washington's Birthday, 1919, I assisted 20,000 other Americans of Irish origin to place a wreath upon that monument erected to the Irish father of the American navy. That we remember whence we came and the present travail of the motherland softens not the bitterness that anti-Irish falsehood inspires, nor does it blind us, as Americans, to the ideals upon which America is built.

The International Church

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

INEVITABLY as the talk of uniting first the sects and ultimately all Americans into a great American Church goes forward, Catholics as individuals and as a body will be approached with an invitation to join in the movement. The movement will be put before them as a magnificently patriotic scheme in keeping with our spirit of national unity and greatness. Just where, then, will Catholics take their stand? It will seem arrogant, self-conceited, selfish to stand apart and refuse to join in a movement that, in the opinion of its promoters, is destined to wipe out the discord and senseless waste of effort which every thoughtful man deplors. Worse than that, it will seem unpatriotic to refuse to take part in an effort to bind Americans into a great national Church. Is there nothing for it but a stern, uncompromising refusal?

The question of a national religion is not a new one for Catholics. They have faced it often enough in times past. Rome had its national religion, a worship of the State. Membership meant little in the way of belief or worship: a grain or two of incense, an occasional formal visit to the temples. Refusal to profess this religion meant the loss of social prestige, of civil rights and privileges; and often enough it meant fire and the lions. But the Catholics of those brave days stood firm. They longed for religious unity; they craved that all Romans might belong to one great Church; but they never questioned for a moment what Church that must be.

Germany and England, Scotland and Wales, each in turn set up a national religion within which one found rank and privilege, while outside were social ostracism, political disability, loss of property, and often of life. But for Catholics there could be no hesitation. The French Revolution set up its national religion with Reason enthroned on the altar of Notre Dame; a refusal to join was regarded as impious rather than treasonable. But though the guillotine rose and fell with tireless energy, Catholics went calmly on their way, clinging to their own Church, no matter what the price they paid for their isolation.

And so it must be with any proposed American Church. Back of all this apparent obstinacy and self-satisfaction lies the conviction that Christ founded one only Church, and that all other Churches are not of His making. Their Church is not a human institution, a thing of compromises and makeshifts, suiting itself to the passing fancies of the time and turning in every wind that blows from north or

south. It is a Church Divinely commissioned with the task of bringing immortal souls to Christ. All other churches are human institutions, partial, incomplete, transitory, shifting; their Church is Divine, complete, permanent, unshaken by the ages that swirl past it.

The members of such a Church cannot for a moment regard their doctrines as unessential. Each dogma is a God-given answer to a spiritual question that now more than ever clamors for solution. To invite them to join in a religious union based on the supposition that all creeds are unessential, that it really matters little whether Christ was God or not, whether redemption is a fact or the fancy of early religious enthusiasm, whether the Eucharist is the true center of worship on earth or simple idolatry, is to invite them to a treason greater than treason to country; for that would be treason to Christ and to God. When many of the disciples said to Jesus after He had promised them the Eucharist: "This saying is hard, and who can hear it?" He allowed them to go away and walk no more with Him. Christ wanted unity more than the most fervent Catholic that ever lived, but He did not want unity that must be purchased through compromises, through denials and rejections of the truth. And the Catholic stands with Christ. We cannot unite ourselves in any real religious sense with those who compromise, deny or reject the faith which Jesus Christ laid down as the basis of His Church. We cannot betray Him, no matter what the price offered.

It must always be hard to make Protestants understand our attitude toward our Church. That is merely proof that in reality they never give to their churches anything like the complete confidence and acquiescence that Catholics give to theirs. They cannot understand how anyone should be so completely satisfied with his religion as to feel that it is capable of no essential improvement. It is the difference between those who know that their Church is the handiwork of a Divine Redeemer who promised to remain with it all days, to shield it from error and to guard it even against the gates of hell, and those who, despite their verbal protests, look back to a human founder none too perfect in himself and far less perfect in his work. Catholics are sure of their position; Protestants, in so much as talking of a great American Church, implicitly admit that they are by no means certain of theirs.

Must we, then, stand aside in this great movement for religious unity? Can we take no part in what may be so beneficial to our country at large? The war has answered this question at least in part. In all that concerns merely the temporal welfare of mankind, in works of charity and relief, in political and social reforms, we not only can but should stand shoulder to shoulder with all the forces that are working for noble ends by justified means. In such things we should be ready and eager to meet the Churches in the spirit of generous co-operation. It would be a mistake, serious and misleading, to act otherwise.

But where there is a moment's question of sacrificing

religious truth, or of taking a stand seeming to indicate that we regard our doctrines as of such slight value that we can sink all religious differences and religious difference in one great union, then Catholics can go not one step. We could no more join ourselves with a church that regards faith as unessential and makes no account of the supernatural than we could bow our knees in a Moslem mosque or burn incense to Buddah.

For all that, far from acting as reactionaries, setting ourselves firmly against the hoped-for religious unity, we Catholics are confident that with us lies the only genuine hope. It cannot be forgotten that while the other religious bodies go on their course of disintegration, the Catholic Church continues constantly to grow more firmly united. Today the Catholic Church alone presents to the world of unbelief a unified, consistent front; it alone answers each religious query, not with a dozen conflicting opinions, but with a single, unvarying response. In the midst of a world clamoring for the solution of its religious difficulties, its voice alone speaks with the power and authority that resemble the voice of Christ. It alone dares to claim a Divine commission to teach not merely the American people, but the whole world.

And that is precisely what the world of today needs. We are through with national Churches. The English Church, the German Church, the Scottish Church have fallen into admitted failure, as fell the national churches of the ancient world. We have opening before us an era of internationalism, and the one Church that dares to open its arms to all people is the Catholic Church. Protestantism is essentially provincial. An American Church would be even more provincial in character than Protestantism. In the Catholic Church alone lies the hope of that international religion that can weld all the nations together in a common faith and a unified worship.

Such a unity is not at this late day easy of achievement. Protestantism has split too disastrously the unity of Christendom for that. Concessions that will draw the heart's blood, concessions that only a Church with authority from God Himself could demand, will have to be made. And those concessions will be the concessions of error to truth, not of truth to error.

We Catholics are only too well aware that one cannot waive the differences of belief by quoting a few fine phrases or by ignoring difficulties that are root-deep. We are certain, however, that only in the Catholic Church with its unity of Divinely appointed authority, its complete unanimity on matters of faith, its perfect conformity in worship, will the honest seeker after religious unity find his heart's desire.

If the American really desires religious unity, he can find it, together with a peace surpassing understanding, in the only real American religion, the Catholic Church. In it he will find more than mere national religious unity; he will find that religious internationality which was what Christ really longed for when He spoke of One Fold and One Shepherd.

The Principles of Publicity

MICHAEL WILLIAMS

A CORRESPONDENT who gives no address in his letter has sent me such a trenchant criticism of the views I have been expressing in my articles on Catholic publicity, in *AMERICA*, that being unable to send a reply to him directly I am impelled to make a public response; not only, I confess, for the sake of reaching the critic whose rapier has drawn blood, but also with the hope, which animates me in all my writings on this subject, of keeping alive, even if I cannot stir up, general interest in this most important matter.

The essential portions of the letter I allude to are as follows:

You have missed the very soul of publicity; you make it an effect instead of a cause. Catholic publicity is a matter of "Feed my sheep." Publicity is a force to be applied in such a way by those who preach Christ Crucified as to make all Catholics real Catholics. Why do you ruin an otherwise perfectly excellent article ["Catholic Publicity Again," in *AMERICA* for January 18] by that weak, alibi-seeking "Nevertheless, despite the work already accomplished . . . the Catholic laity, especially that portion of it known as our 'wealthy and prominent Catholics,' are still benumbed with apathy, lame with impotence, sluggish with the slow poison of indifference" etc. Forget the carping; obstacles are to be overcome, not constantly featured.

Up in one corner of this stimulating and welcome letter are the initials "A. M. D. G." Glorious motto! Well do I remember the time and the place when and where I first learned the significance of those four mystic letters, and breathed the spirit of that greatest of all great mottoes. It was in a Jesuit novitiate, among the lonely and lovely California mountains, in May, the month of Mary, when each evening as the sunset breeze blew through the green and shimmering vineyard sloping down to the plaza where Our Mother's statue stood amid golden candle-lights and flowers, the strong, splendid young Soldiers of Christ sang in a body their thrilling vesper hymns, and the solitary convert who was privileged to be among them, on his first retreat, saw their simple and most beautiful ceremony as a figure of the life of Heaven, and heard in their songs the echo of the choir invisible! For the greater glory of God! The truest, highest, most perfect, and most practical of all human motives of thought, word, and deed. In that spirit my critic takes me to task; in that spirit may I answer him, not for the sake of controversy, but for the sake of profitable discussion of a great subject upon the principles of which there is a compelling need for Catholics to agree so that something may be done, A. M. D. G.

Now I know that it is confoundingly easy to keep plugging away at the practical details of your work, no matter what that work may be, until you get immersed in them to the neglect, sometimes to the very stultification, of the thing you desire to accomplish. Artists, for example, whether in words, or tone, or color, or form, often become so interested in problems of technique and

craftsmanship—yes, and market conditions!—that they sometimes let perish the root of the matter which their souls should constantly nourish, namely, the desire of beauty, the craving to create. Politicians plunge so deeply into the tactics of party or personal success that they forget that the good of the people should be the end of their efforts. I recently read in Cardinal Mercier's "Conferences" that even clergymen do at times grow so engrossed in parish business, or scholarship, or sacerdotal details as to forget the fructifying influences of meditation and personal prayer. In short, as William James said in one of his essays, commenting upon a similar statement of Chesterton's, it is vitally necessary for us all, for workers in any branch of human endeavor, to probe and to grasp the philosophy of our work; to get at its underlying and determining principles. Therefore, I realize and acknowledge that my mordant critic does me a service and the cause of Catholic publicity a service, by insisting upon a discussion of the principles of this subject.

According to him, in the many articles I have written, I "have missed the very soul of publicity"; having made it to be an effect instead of a cause; for, in his view, publicity "is a force to be applied in such a way by those who preach Christ Crucified as to make all Catholics real Catholics." In the absence of an explicit explanation by my correspondent of the implications and explications of his suggestive and meaty definition of publicity, I am forced to do my best, unassisted, to get at its practical meanings. I suppose then that my critic probably thinks, as a good many very sincere and interested Catholics do think, that organized, deliberate, planned publicity, i. e. —to limit the subject, for convenience sake, to one only of its branches—press propaganda concerned with Catholic news, views, opinions, etc., is wrong, or at least useless, because such methods are not in accord with the genius of Catholicism, being second-hand, derivative and adulterated. Putting it more plainly, this view of the subject, I presume, opposes organized, modern, practical publicity plans for the extension of Catholicism and of its influence, because it fears that such propaganda would be too businesslike in the sense that it would tend to fall into the hands of those who would make it their occupation, their profession, but who would not necessarily find in it their vocation, their devotion, their opportunity for self-sacrifice. Publicity that *would* be consonant with the spirit of the Church, according to this presumed view of the matter, would be the diffusion of *only* such writing—again to keep to the province of the written word—as has emanated or will emanate from "the souls of the just made perfect," or of those seriously striving for perfection, i. e., the Saints, the Doctors, the illuminated souls of the Church, the true preachers of the Word made Flesh, the shepherds of the flock, the consecrated.

Now I hasten to declare at once with all the emphasis I may command that with one very important element

of this view I am in unshakable agreement. I mean the element of authority. With the principle that "publicity is a force to be applied in such a way by those who preach Christ Crucified as to make all Catholics real Catholics," there can be and should be no shadow of disagreement. Those who preach Christ Crucified are our lawful leaders, the clergy; no Catholic movement or labor could be fruitful of good that contained any, even the least, departure from the principle of obedience to and leadership by the priests of Jesus Christ. Better by far that we should never have a national information bureau or a national Catholic daily, or more vigorous and interesting Catholic diocesan weeklies, or a propaganda directed upon the secular press than that we should have any or all these things but have them diverted even if only slightly from the full and constant direction and control of those who "preach Christ Crucified," our bishops and our priests.

But Catholic publicity, as I judge the matter, may be promoted for precisely the great end urged by my critic, and under the direction of those lawfully appointed to feed the flock of Christ, and still be susceptible of functioning in organized, modern, practical channels, and of thus giving scope to the earnest activities of hundreds of the laity—both men and women and writers, reporters, editors, scholars—so long as this fundamental principle of obedience and loyalty to authority is recognized.

It is true, of course, as any man or woman with any practical acquaintance with realities will readily grant, that there is a danger that organized Catholic publicity methods would be seized upon by selfish and unscrupulous individuals—if they could manage it—as useful instruments for self-advertisement, self-advantage, or party advertisement, and party politics. But the existence of dangers is a pitiful excuse for refraining from actions otherwise advantageous. Such dangers as those mentioned have menaced and at times injured the operations of the Church in all ages under all conditions. They menace the Church in some respects today. I know men of the stamp so mordantly described as "titular Catholics," in a recent AMERICA editorial, "many-sided, smug, smiling folk to whom religion serves as a means for cheap notoriety or social advancement, or a high rate of interest," who are most anxious indeed that "the mighty influence of the Catholic Church" shall forthwith be exerted everywhere in the world "in the interests of safe, sane, and conservative reconstruction," a blessed "bromide," quite inspiring, nevertheless, if emanating from a right motive; but in the vocabulary of too many "titular Catholics" it simply expresses their hope that nothing shall be permitted to disturb the social conditions under which they and their kind, within and without the Church—mainly without, thank God—being "a small number of rich men," as Leo XIII put the case—have been enabled "to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself." Yet it remains

true that the Church can and will exert its influence toward a sane and conservative reconstruction of the distracted world.

For the life of me I cannot see why in trying to devise a mechanism whereby American Catholics may greatly aid the mission of the Church of Christ by efficient, practical, organized methods of press propaganda, the incidental dangers and difficulties seen to be attached to such methods should be permitted to paralyze our will. Nor can I understand how in urging these practical methods I "have missed the very soul of publicity." But if I have—and I do not deny that I may have done so—I want to know it. I think it is the duty of my respected critic to make me see it, if he can. If he represents a school of thought that really is able to advance practical arguments against the policy of publicity which in common with many others I have been urging, then those arguments should be put forward. I can understand, and in a great measure appreciate and approve of a policy of Catholic social action that would consistently refrain from all organized, deliberate, press propaganda, other than that which emanates from the literary productions of Catholic writers spontaneously exercising their usual functions of teachers, and preachers, and scholars, and artists; and which would depend for the extension of the Church and of its influence, solely upon the ordained channels of the Sacraments, of the schools, of the pulpit, of personal sanctity. Yes, but I cannot understand why we should put up with a poor press, and spasmodic and inconsistent publicity efforts. If we try to do anything at all, surely we should try to do it well, so long as it is not evil in itself. At present we Catholics are dabbling in publicity, but not doing it well. Then let us drop it altogether or do it in a measure and a manner commensurate with the dignity, the strength and the transcendently great mission of Holy Mother Church. A. M. D. G.

As for the "carping" in which I indulged, and for which my critic smites me, the carping against the indifference of too many Catholics to the crying need for Catholic social action, I suppose I am wrong, but I have not yet repented!

A Query Concerning the K. of C.

D. J. MCCARTHY

UNLESS something like vigorous opinion is registered to the contrary the Knights of Columbus may be penalized as a war-work organization simply and solely because they are popular. This is strange, but, wherever a group of multi-millionaires are gathered together, some strange thing will be found in the midst. The group of multi-millionaires is the Committee of Eleven, or rather some members of that august body, who have in their hands a great trust without having submitted to any public test of their trustworthiness. This committee is composed of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Mortimer L. Schiff, Cleveland Dodge, Myron T. Herrick, John G. Agar, James J. Phelan, George W. Perkins, Dr. John R. Mott, George Gordon Battle, Raymond B. Fosdick and some other gentleman whose

name is not readily recalled. One or two of the names in this list figured rather conspicuously in recent municipal history. They are not all multi-millionaires, this committee of eleven; but there are enough multi-millionaires upon the committee to make its proceedings worthy of discreet editorial treatment.

The authority vested in the Committee of Eleven consists chiefly of supervision over the funds collected in the United War Work Drive of last November. It will be recalled by those who have followed the history of the war-relief work, that last August the Knights of Columbus were forced to appeal to President Wilson over a decree by the Secretary of War that there be two distinct and separate war drives, one for the Y. M. C. A. and kindred organizations, the other by the K. of C., the Salvation Army and the Jewish Welfare Board. The President, recognizing the force of the K. of C. argument that a dual drive would be tantamount to a drawing of the religious line, endorsed the movement for one drive. The drive took place on the basis of budgets submitted by the seven war-relief organizations. The original K. of C. budget had called for fifty million dollars. But the Knights entailed official disapproval in their preaching and practice of "Everything Free." They were compelled to abandon that slogan and their budget was reduced to \$25,000,000, in short, halved.

They went into the drive; the splendid repute they had earned, together with the excellent reputations of those organizations placed beside them in the plan for a dual drive—the Salvation Army and the Jewish Welfare Board—aided largely in obtaining pledges for the huge sum of over \$200,000,000, though the goal had been \$190,500,000. This pledged money was all to be paid in by March 1. On that day about fifty per cent of the money had been paid in. Unquestionably the advent of peace had a great deal to do with this latter fact, as also, perhaps, the rather vigorous condemnation of certain forms of relief work. This diversion lends light to the central puzzle we are trying to solve: Why the Knights of Columbus are singled out for restricted activity?

In their budget calling for an expenditure of \$25,000,000, the Knights had made a provision of some ten or eleven million dollars for the purchase of creature comforts: chocolate, gum drops, chewing gum, soap, towels, etc., the kind of little luxuries that the folk at home would certainly bring to their boys if they visited them. It has been officially stated that none of the other organizations had contemplated spending so large a percentage of their funds, nor so large an absolute amount, on creature comforts for free distribution. But the Knights, having pleaded for and accepted the public money on the basis of their policy of providing free creature comforts, constructed their program of free-giving in dutiful recognition of the wishes of their subscribers and of the demands of the men in the service, articulated cordially enough in the appreciation shown for the K. of C. gifts.

And although another organization saw fit to amend its budget and appropriate a sum for free gifts more approximate to that of the Knights, the K. of C. said nothing. There was nothing to be said. Their policy was settled and definite. They would abide by it. They had no desire to interfere with others. But suddenly the Committee of Eleven decided that no organization of the seven should be permitted to expend more than ten per cent of its quota on free creature comforts for the soldiers. Here, indeed, a strange note was struck, for this ruling, if put into effect, would mean that the Knights and the Salvation Army would altogether be eclipsed by organizations having much larger quotas. In short, it would mean a complete overthrow of the K. of C. policy and perhaps a nullification of the good repute both they and the Salvation Army had builded by their limitless hospitality to the men in the service.

What then? The Knights of Columbus Supreme Board of Directors met in Chicago and passed a spirited resolution denying the power of the Committee of Eleven and of the Fosdick Com-

mission on Training Camp Activities to interfere in the policy that had been supported by the people and had proved successful with the men in the service. Supreme officers of the K. of C. went to Secretary Baker and laid their case before him. What the Secretary's decision may be is irrelevant to our puzzle, which is double-barreled. Why should any attempt be made to limit the famously good work of the Knights of Columbus? And why should this Committee of Eleven, in whose name the money was not gathered and whose authority the public have had no opportunity either to establish or approve, be permitted to apply the brake to the surprisingly efficient war machine which the Knights of Columbus have developed from the mother-wit of their own organization?

It is stated that General Pershing has requested that gifts of candy to his men be limited to five per cent of the money contributed in the war-fund campaign. This looks, in rather sordid metaphor, to be very much like an attempt "to pass the buck" to the good General. It intimates a knowledge of the confectionery market which it is difficult to believe that General Pershing has acquired in the last few exciting months of his career. Furthermore, it contradicts the known desires of the A. E. F., for anybody who has been in France or on our transports, or, for that matter, in any home camp, is convinced of the permanent popularity of generous supplies of sweetmeats.

Are these bars of chocolate and bags of gum drops and sticks of chewing gum too much for the delicate stomachs of the "huskies" who smashed the mightiest military machine in the history of the world? *O tempora! O mores! O Spearmint!* He would be a bold and, no doubt, an honorably discharged military physician who would come out into the open air and denounce the liberal giving of sweetmeats to the fighting men.

No! There is some other explanation for the attempt to interfere with the policy of the Knights, which is a direct way in which to curtail their popularity. They are not the rivals of any other organization. They recognize the fine work done by other organizations and they are rightfully glad that they have struck a policy popular with the public and with the uniformed sons and brothers of the public. They ask that that policy be undisturbed. Common honesty demands that they be left unimpeded in the fulfilment of their pledge to those who entrusted it to them. The Committee of Eleven thinks differently. Why?

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters, as a rule, should not exceed six hundred words

Catholic Students in Catholic Colleges

To the Editor of AMERICA:

If we omit the regrettable intrusion of personalities, which will be proved unfounded on a careful reading of this correspondence, F. J. R., in AMERICA for March 1, makes no contribution of note to the discussion. The competition of non-Catholic colleges was admitted from the first. F. J. R. agrees with Dr. Burns, whom I quoted, that owing to proximity Catholics attend non-Catholic colleges. The point of the discussion is what should be considered the dominant factors in the attendance at Catholic colleges. F. X. M. did not, *pace* F. J. R., "puncture the figures" I gave. They were the official figures given by the colleges themselves. But F. X. M. did attempt to show that the indifference of Catholics in Baltimore and Philadelphia was the dominant factor why so few students are in Catholic colleges there. He has not convinced me yet that Baltimore and Philadelphia have in Catholic colleges proportionately fewer Catholic students of college grade than other vicinities have. But, even conceding that point, I consider the chief reason to be the financial condition of the Catholics and the number of competing colleges in the neighborhood.

Only after most convincing proofs would I be willing to admit that Catholics are indifferent to higher education. I had the

pleasure of spending a year at Villanova more than thirty years ago, and I know that it had many fine fellows from Philadelphia and its vicinity. I do not know the exact numbers now, but I am quite sure they will be found to be noteworthy and numerous.

There is a feature about New England which has not been sufficiently emphasized as yet. New England is well provided with free high schools. As a consequence, while elsewhere in most cases Catholics must pay for eight years of education, in New England the free high school halves the expenses, and that means much where there are many in the family.

That some Catholics are indifferent and that some send their sons to non-Catholic colleges is unhappily true, but that any large number of Catholics is not eager for higher education and for the honor of a priest in the family, I am very reluctant to admit. In my first letter I showed from the figures of Dr. Burns and from other figures that Catholics are doing more for college education in proportion to their number than non-Catholics.

Finally, were it shown that the indifference alleged by F. X. M. or the lure of society mentioned by J. F. R. were dominating factors, the conclusion I wished to draw in my first letter would not be impaired. In that letter I urged that a change of curriculum, the importation of athletes, the relaxation of discipline will not appreciably increase the numbers in Catholic colleges. Father Ross has specifically attacked this conclusion. He advocates courses of engineering and architecture. Villanova, the Christian Brothers and other schools have been offering such courses. Will someone tell us whether they have notably increased their numbers by such courses?

Worcester.

FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S. J.

Knights of Columbus Auxiliary Association

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The excellent work accomplished by the Knights of Columbus in ministering to the physical and spiritual needs of our soldiers on the battlefields of France, and in the camps and cantonments at home, is a pardonable source of pride to every Catholic throughout the land. These notable achievements were largely due to the heroic sacrifice of our Catholic people, magnanimously aided by our Jewish and Protestant fellow-citizens. With the cessation of hostilities, the social-welfare work of the Knights of Columbus must not cease. We must enable them to continue their admirable efforts.

The campaign of the Knights for 1,000,000 members is a step in the right direction, but it will not realize the purposes of the directors, for reasons so patent that it is not necessary to enumerate them here. Vast sums of money will be needed to carry out the social and religious program of the Knights of Columbus on a permanent and efficient basis, and with this end in view I suggest the formation of a Knights of Columbus Auxiliary Association, and the enrolment of every Catholic man, woman, and child in this society, with the annual dues for adults fixed at one dollar per year, and children under sixteen years of age at twenty-five cents a year. I have taken up this plan with many Catholics, and it has met with their hearty endorsement. No time is to be lost now. Launch the project at once!

Boston.

J. C.

Strange Discrimination

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Recently I found myself in the public library of Cincinnati, and having a few moments to spare I wandered over to the periodical rack. While looking rather aimlessly over the magazines, I remembered an article in AMERICA that I had not finished, and I began to hunt for it. I looked on both sides of the rack and saw magazines and periodicals pertaining to Chris-

tian Science, New Thought, Feminism and other modern "isms," but AMERICA was nowhere to be found. I went over to the lady at the desk who has charge of the periodicals and told her what I was looking for. Very meekly she opened a drawer of the desk, turned over other Catholic magazines concealed there, and finally handed me the desired number. Very much surprised I asked the reason why AMERICA and the other Catholic magazines were kept in the drawer and not on the rack with the others. Her answer was that they were often carried away. She requested me to return the copy of AMERICA to the desk as soon as I had finished with it.

Why should there be discrimination made between Catholic and non-Catholic periodicals in a library maintained by public money? Is this fair to Catholics and to those outside of the Faith who are searching for truth? We are not asking for privileges, but we do want justice.

Cincinnati.

C. W. A.

Scholastic Philosophy and Modern Liberty

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your correspondent who signed himself "J. R." in the issue of AMERICA for February 22 must have missed the real point of my article on "Scholastic Philosophy and Modern Liberty." I do not believe in eugenics nor was I, when writing the article, in any way concerned with questions of ethnology. As far as I can see, it makes very little difference of what race the men were who helped to shape the Anglo-American tradition of liberty. Archbishop Theodore, for one, was not even a European but an Asiatic Greek from Tarsus in Cilicia. Yet, owing to the ecclesiastical organization he effected, he provided the solid foundation upon which the later political unity of England was reared. Stephen Langton might have been an Irishman without detriment to my argument. The fact is he was an Englishman. But the really important thing about him, as far as my contention went, was that in wresting Magna Carta from John Lackland he succeeded in giving concrete shape to what is historically and quite correctly known as Anglo-Saxon liberty. This, moreover, takes its importance, for us, not so much from the fact that it was Anglo-Saxon as that it constituted an important step in the formation of that tradition of liberty which in time developed into our American liberty.

It may perhaps make my meaning clearer if you recall, as was pointed out by Fénelon in his day, and as Burke tried to remind the leaders of the French Revolution, that France had had a well-developed medieval tradition of liberty and had lost it. The same is true of Spain and would have been true of England had it not been for the reasons briefly stated in my article. Had all three traditions been allowed to develop they would have been very distinct, each from the other. As it is, the English tradition alone survived and this is the one which, in any event, we should have inherited, as *de facto* we did.

If I insisted mainly on scholastic philosophy as that which alone could reestablish a harmony between ourselves and the institutions slowly but gradually built up during the course of 700 years and more, I did not intend to imply that scholastic philosophy by itself would have given us that liberty which is ours. On the contrary I would emphatically maintain that just because we have allowed ourselves to fall into the habit of writing and talking about American liberty as though it were something abstract and apart from our inherited institutions and their real history, we are fast becoming what France, for all her democratic forms, has been for the last fifty years: an oligarchy. I merely wished to point out to the many who at present are deeply concerned about the future of American democracy that scholastic philosophy is the one and only philosophy capable of giving correct ideas about liberty and about the true function of government; and this I attempted to do by showing what it had actually accomplished in the past.

If I dwelt on the part the Whigs had in recovering our tradition of liberty I did not wish to be understood as meaning that they necessarily grasped the full bearing of what they took over from scholasticism. Locke certainly did not, and to the student of scholastic philosophy very much in the writings of Jefferson creates an impression not unlike that produced by the sight of a ten-year-old marching about in his father's Sunday coat and tall hat.

In conclusion, then, I would merely add that facts are facts after all and, whether we like it or not, we *are* dependent on them; nor can I see any hope for the future except in a renewal of the medieval and Christian conviction that "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Though we may become co-workers with Him for its improvement, we can do so no otherwise than by adapting ourselves to the universe as we find it. That this, moreover, is not quite the tinkering men took it to be, has been abundantly demonstrated by the world war. Hence this is no time to be flattering ourselves with vain dreams about either the past, the present or the future, but it seriously behooves us all to look for real solutions of our problems in the reason for things as they are.

Woodstock, Md.

M. F. X. MILLAR, S.J.

A Mother's Reflections

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read with the deepest interest many articles appearing lately in AMERICA and elsewhere on the subject of Catholic higher education. Having a family, the members of which attend both grade and high schools, I naturally have problems which give food for reflection. Some time ago an article in one of the large dailies commented on the small number of Catholics, proportionately, who held the rank of officers in the army and navy, and attributed it to lack of education; and parents were urged by Catholic authorities to give more co-operation. In an article which appeared in AMERICA for January 18, Father Donnelly, S.J., said that, once through high school, the eagerness to progress, judged by members, is greater in students from Catholic schools than in those from the public schools, adding, however, that "the transition from elementary school to secondary school is not so encouraging." Evidently this is the weak point in the line of progress.

Of course lack of means has a great deal to do with the problem, but there are other factors, to judge from my own experience, which increase the difficulties of parents. One is the amount of "social life" pupils, beginning with the eighth grade, demand nowadays; another is the movies, which I think have created an abnormal desire for excitement, and a corresponding distaste for better, soberer things and especially for the grind which is necessary in the child trying to go through high school successfully. This leads to falling behind in studies, to discouragement, and finally to dropping out of school before finishing. I remember reading some years ago that in Germany the picture-shows which children attend are not only censored, but in addition the age at which the child may attend, the time, and the conditions under which he may do so, are strictly regulated. If this be so, it is a thing which Americans might profitably imitate.

I am an enthusiastic admirer of the moving-picture art at its best, but I think that unregulated it is the most demoralizing influence on youthful minds of the present day, because it is so universal, so cheap, and so unrestricted as to the number of times a child may see its representations, and in spite of censorship, often so undesirable. Children may attend high school, but their minds are in no condition to receive solid instruction when they are aflame with the previous evening's picture-show, and are eagerly planning the next diversion in the way of parties, dances, basket-ball games and pictures. Nowadays girls do not regard with regret the day on which they leave home to work

their way in the world, on the contrary, they long to drop school, and to do as they please, in other words, to do as their favorite movie-heroine does. Think of suggesting the lives of the Saints as matter for thought or example to minds possessed by the movies!

The possibility of being able to run to a picture-show any time the child possesses the small price necessary, and the shirking of responsibility by some mothers in giving their young children permission to go simply to get rid of them for a while, with no care for the kind of picture which they are to see, or for the habit they are forming, have led to disregard for home-obligations to such an extent that it is looked on as quite a condescension on the part of young people at present to spend a quiet evening at home, no matter how attractive that home may be. Even in this far-away, practically isolated little town of the West we find it very hard to curb the children in this respect. It seems to be a general condition which diverts children's minds from the business of youth, the acquiring of an education, especially at the high-school age, when romance is rife. One of our Western city papers remarked recently that it is a hard task nowadays to get boys and girls to appreciate the importance of an education, and said that it seems as if parents co-operate less and less as the years go by. I do not think the latter opinion is just. There is such a thing as parents being hopelessly overwhelmed by the current of popular indifference and custom which surges around them, and finally giving up the struggle in despair.

Someone has called this the century of the child; it is well named; we can testify that it is not the century of the parent, though it may be the fault of the mothers who have adopted the freaks of the age. However, we are all paying up for it. If our boys, the fathers of the future, come back from the war with reconstructed ideas of discipline and respect for authority it will be the biggest thing the war has done for this country.

Is any concerted action being taken by Catholic authorities to meet this evil? If there is, it would be encouraging to hear about it, for I think it would be a national benefit.

Choteau, Mont.

F. M. P.

Prohibition

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The Manicheans were vigorously condemned by every emperor of their time, whether heretical or orthodox. They were the first to make any appreciable noise in our historic world with the denunciation of liquor as Satan's own invention. Mohammed, because he was publicly insulted by a drunken follower, took the same line. Prohibition is a dogma of Mohammedanism. Protestantism is now boldly following the Manicheans and Mohammed. To borrow from the once famous *Hudibras*, they express their creed thus in rhyme:

A man will surely save his soul
If he thinks what he pleases;
But I'll be damned, and so will he,
If he drinks what he pleases.

So be it, but let us not call the doctrine Christian. Its historic ancestors would have disdained the name, nor are the arguments adduced for the doctrine, Christian in the least. Some of them are not even sane.

It gives one a good idea of the calibre of Prohibitionists to read their letters to the papers. Many insist that the Hebrew or Greek equivalent for wine meant "unfermented grape juice." This is clearly incorrect. Wine does not mean "unfermented grape juice." Another vigorous Prohibitionist gathers up texts of the Bible, pointing out the bad consequences of abusing liquor, and concludes with a whoop that the Bible condemns drink. Abuse and use of the Bible is so much one to him that use and abuse of anything

and everything have grown to mean the same thing. He cannot and will not see text after text in the Old and New Testament clearly indicating that God allows and approves of the right use of this creature, as He does in the case of every other creature. The clinching fact that the Saviour used bread and wine, the common human food, as the best symbol to express His spiritual food, is utterly ignored or perverted by him. Another declares with immense self-appreciation and emphasis that never shall his son smell beer upon his father's breath. Happy son! But the father is assuming as true the very point at issue. Another man quotes St. Paul: "If meat scandalize my brother, I will not eat meat forever." At last we have a sane and sensible argument. Would they were all like it! But the gentleman using it, misuses it. St. Paul was talking of himself and for himself. All men admire him for his self-determination. They would not admire him if he imposed his personal preferences and mortifications on everyone else by force. He says, "I will not eat meat"; he does not selfishly and illogically add, "and neither shall anyone else."

I have noticed that men with degrees after their name are adding their weight as scientists, to assert that: "Liquor never did and never could do anybody any good." May I first call attention to an obvious fact too often ignored? Science and scientists are not the same thing. Scientists have a reproachable habit of late of prefacing their statements with: "Science says." Now science says nothing. Science is an abstraction. It is the body of known and classified truth. This body has no tongue to speak with. Scientists take the liberty of speaking in its name, and fortunately for them and unfortunately for us, it cannot contradict or correct them. Now a scientist is a specialist with all the prejudices and ignorances of an ordinary man on most subjects outside his specialty. As Chesterton says: "The trouble with specialists is, not that they know a lot about one thing, but that they know so little of anything else."

Science about liquor, or to use the equivalent words, the known and classified experience about the use, not the abuse, of liquor, extends over the period from Noah to the present time. I think that it may safely be said that the broad conclusion of that experience is, that in the use, not the abuse, of liquor there is much pleasure, promotion of good-fellowship, help to digestion, brightening of the spirits, and no appreciable bodily harm or degeneration. Some scientists meet this universal conclusion with a few experiments telling the effect of alcohol on dead tissue, not live tissue, and a few more experiments about the effect that liquor has in lengthening reaction time. About the first experiments I shall not argue, for I have no means of verifying or controlling them. I only know, as does every man, that dead bugs are preserved by alcohol and that live ones do not use it. Any educated man, however, with the minutest explanation, can verify reaction times with the scientific instruments at his disposal in a laboratory, and if he finds that alcohol slows up all the mental processes, he has found in a laboratory what universal experience has not found outside the laboratory.

The whole Prohibition movement is another proof that whatever Protestantism touches it spoils. Its first slogan was "justification by faith alone," and with it Protestantism has succeeded with lamentable success in destroying all faith in Christ the Son of God. Its new slogan is "justification by works," and straightway it sets about destroying good-works, by doing away with the virtue of temperance. For Prohibition does away not only with temperance but with the possibility of temperance as regards drink. A simple example makes this plainer than lengthy explanations could. We praise a bank cashier who does not steal for the virtue of honesty, because he does not steal when he can. But we do not praise a man in state's prison for the virtue of honesty, though he steals no money either. There is no virtue in a man's not stealing when he cannot do so.

Baltimore.

J. M. PRENDERGAST.

Nation-Wide Protest

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Let me congratulate you on the effort you are making to arouse Catholics to a sense of the danger that threatens Catholic education in the Smith and Towner bills. I notice that several other Catholic papers have come out against the policy contained in the Smith bill. I earnestly hope that our Catholic people will quickly be awakened to a realization of the fact that the Smith and Towner bills mean the destruction of Catholic education, and that while Catholic parents it is not a question of mere policy or expediency, but a question of conscience. From the issue for February 1 of *School Life*, published twice a month, by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education. I extract this brief sentence: "Representatives of the various organizations interested in the bill [Smith-Towner bill], stated that they intend to urge *prompt* action." (Italics inserted.) Some of the organizations backing this bill are the American Federation of Labor, the American Federation of Teachers, and the National Education Association.

Just as the country awoke suddenly to the fact that National Prohibition was a reality and not a dream, so, I fear, Catholics will soon be jarred into the sad realization that their schools, which have cost them so many years of labor and so many millions of dollars, have been lost to them. I would suggest that the Catholic Educational Association or the Catholic University of Washington start at once a nation-wide protest. A circular might be printed giving briefly the reasons to be urged against the bill, and sent to every Catholic educator and to every priest in the country, with the request that they sign this protest themselves and get as many of their parishioners as possible to sign it, and then forward it to their representatives at Washington. A printed slip should be enclosed with this circular, informing the citizens of the various States who their Senators and Congressmen are, and also the members of any committee that may have charge of the Smith-Towner and similar bills.

Unless some responsible party gets back of this protest and organizes it, nothing more than a few scattered letters will reach the waste-basket in Washington.

Kansas City.

C. E.

New York's First Native Bishop

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the biographical note printed by the daily papers in connection with the appointment of Archbishop Hayes, it was stated that he was the first native New Yorker to fill the See. Strange to say, this error has been repeated in a number of our Catholic weeklies. Cardinal McCloskey, New York's second Archbishop, was born in New York (State); in the city (Brooklyn) as it is now, and in the diocese of New York, as then constituted. His birthplace is almost under the shadow of the ramparts of Fort Greene, which his father helped to construct to defend New York against the expected attack of the British vandals of the War of 1812. It is a curious incident that of the seven Archbishops, Hanna, Mundelein, Shaw, Dougherty, Dowling, Hayes and Daeger, appointed since June, 1915, four, Hanna, Mundelein, Dowling and Hayes, are natives of New York and, of these four, the three last named were born in New York City.

Cardinal McCloskey was also the first native-born New Yorker ordained in the secular priesthood. He was not, however, the first native New York priest; that honor belongs to the Rev. James A. Neil, born in St. Peter's parish, Dec. 4, 1798. Father Neil became a Jesuit and was ordained a priest of the Order in 1828. He was secularized and returned to New York in October, 1833, and was appointed one of the assistants at St. Peter's, where he died Nov. 5, 1838. An altar to his memory has been built in the Church of the Epiphany.

Brooklyn.

T. F. M.

A M E R I C A

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1919

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

National Discontent

DESPITE the continual and rather vociferous denial of the partisan press there is a great deal of menacing discontent in the country. Unhappily enough, this querulous restlessness is not confined to any particular class of people. All classes, except the profiteers, are affected by it. The workman complains of high prices, the returned soldiers of unemployment, the ordinary citizens of curtailment of liberty through a thousand and one petty laws and regulations, and workmen and soldiers and almost everybody else stand aghast at the unseemly quarrel between the President and Congress, and ask: What next? What next, indeed? Congress has adjourned and left the country in a muddle, and he would be a prophet who could tell what the next nine months will bring us. But it is to be hoped that some strong men will keep their heads and try to lead the people out of the wilderness of discontent. This can only be done by recognizing that our citizens have serious grievances which must be met in a spirit of frank helpfulness that bears with it no odor of the settlement or the soup-kitchen. There is entirely too much philanthropy and too little social legislation. Wrist bands and sweaters and hot baths are excellent in their way and place, but they are a worthless substitute for a means of livelihood, a poor relief for high prices, a mean exchange for curtailed liberty. These last, a livelihood, fair prices and liberty are the present demands, and of course, men will ultimately get all three, if not by fair then by foul means. History has repeated itself and will do so again, unless those who are charged by their office or influence to bring relief, do so quickly. And let them not waste time on palliatives; the day for such frauds is gone. They must strike at the root of the evil and give every man a fair chance to

earn a decent livelihood, in the full liberty of an American citizen. Else Bolshevism will appear on the horizon.

Britain Warns Mr. Wilson

UNSELFISH, ingenuous Britain is angry these days at naughty Mr. Wilson, the President of a commonplace and rather insignificant country created by God to serve British humanity in time of stress by supplying it with gold, silver, bread, beer, cheese, soldiers and other unimportant items such as victory over an enemy. And when Britain is wroth the world quakes and Mr. Wilson with it. Well he might, especially in the present instance, for no pious maiden aunt ever scolded a refractory nephew with more biting sarcasm than the English press scolds the President of the United States. Rising to the heights of the sublime, mordant wit so characteristic of the British people, the *London Globe*, for instance, writes these delicate words, fit to draw laughter in the very face of black adversity:

We venture to remind Mr. Wilson that even the great position of President does not carry with it that of supreme governor of the planet. It will be found on investigation that to attain the fullest success it is safe to follow the admirable rule of minding one's own business.

There now, horrid Mr. Wilson, "take that": put your index finger in your mouth and stand in a dark corner, face to the wall, lest the world, the Irish especially, see your tears. For it would pain Hibernia to realize how much you have already suffered for her.

But that is not the point; it is this, rather. Britain is angry that the President of the United States dared receive a committee of American citizens who wished to draw his attention to Ireland's disabilities. Perhaps England's temper can be explained, if not excused, for, after all, during the last two or three years she has had reason to believe that the United States is one of her colonies. But then, on the other hand, the action of the Americans, who petitioned Mr. Wilson in Ireland's behalf, is not without a slight show of propriety. For despite outward appearances America is not a part of the British Empire and our citizens still have the right of petition. That they should have exercised that right in the present case is also open to a defense, however weak. Long since the President of the United States stirred the war-spirit of the people by declaring:

The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship must rest upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any nation or people.

In other words America went to war that England might no longer misgovern Ireland for Britain's material interest or advantage; and of course, American citizens may, if they wish, sacrifice their reputations with England by appealing to their Chief Executive to stand by

the principles for whose sake their country snatched Britain from the very jaws of Germany. Moreover, England in distress accepted those principles with a ready shout. Sad England made Ireland an international question, glad England, or, maybe, mad England, cannot undo her work, by clamorous sarcasm. And is it possible that Britain does not appreciate that she herself made Ireland an international problem in another way? According to Mr. Wilson the plan for the League of Nations is England's. Article X of the Constitution of the League calls upon the contracting parties "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States, members of the League."

That is very clear. It is equally clear that England went to war that small nations might govern themselves. She has said so officially, again and again and then again. It is just as clear that America went to war for the same purpose. Our President and Congress repeated this so often, that even babes and sucklings understood it at last. Ireland under such clear and persistent tutelage set herself up by the will of the vast majority of her people as an independent State which is anxious to join the League that her territorial integrity and *de jure* existing political independence may be preserved against English aggression. An international problem, immediately, and that, too, under the continued impulse of American and English tutelage by which all nations are declared to have the inalienable right to determine their own form of government.

The Logic of a Prohibitionist

NOTHING is so rare as a day in June except the logic of the dry but babbling Mr. Anderson. He is out against the beloved and illustrious Cardinal of Baltimore once again, this time in a way that would cause even Calvin to smile in pity. His Eminence, forsooth, is inconsistent: years ago, he approved of local option for certain Maryland counties and "residential sections of cities" and now he pronounces the Prohibition amendment to the Constitution unwise. Let us examine the inconsistency. In the case of local option selected groups of citizens from well-defined sections go freely to the polls and, untouched by the sophistry of salaried gallopers for peruna, coco-cola or the Anti-Saloon League, voluntarily vote themselves dry. In other words groups of people impose upon themselves a law which by the very nature of the case is limited to a particular district. Moreover, the people freely make themselves responsible for the existence and observance of the statute, which can be recalled as easily as it was enacted by a vote of the majority. Far otherwise is it with the Federal amendment, which, despite the vastly different exigencies of widely separated parts of this great country, is universal in application. There is the first difference between local option and the constitutional amendment. More than that, the amendment is a perfectly unjustified and un-

justifiable aggression on the police power of sovereign States perfectly able to legislate for or against alcohol in accordance with the wishes of its citizens. There is the second difference between local option and the amendment. Again, local option is enacted by the people themselves, directly, by a free use of the ballot; this amendment was passed by Congress and approved by legislatures which not only held no special mandate from the people, but in some instances deliberately disobeyed the people's desire. There is the third difference between local option and the amendment, and Mr. Anderson once realized this point so well that he used all the power of his pestiferous "religio-political" machine to prevent the people from expressing their will on national Prohibition.

There are many other differences between local option and the amendment: six per cent of the voters, for example, cannot keep the former in the statute book, but six per cent of the voters can keep the Prohibition amendment in the Constitution. That is a great, a very great, difference in the eyes of true Americans.

From all this, it is plain that local option may be approved and the Prohibition amendment condemned, without the shadow of inconsistency. But what may not be expected from a man who proceeds to prove that his Eminence of Baltimore is un-Catholic in his attitude towards the amendment, by citing the decrees of the Baltimore Council on saloons? Presumably the dry logic and ethics of Mr. Anderson run this way: The Baltimore Council was against saloons; Cardinal Gibbons is against the Prohibition Amendment: therefore Cardinal Gibbons is for saloons, and I, Mr. Anderson, Methodist and Prohibitionist, in the name of religion, decency and peruna, warn all Catholics against the aforesaid Cardinal who has sadly lapsed from his high estate and stands in sore need of instruction in Catholicism from a Methodist layman willing to disperse light for the modest stipend of \$10,000 a year.

Verily, by warning against the dangers of saloons the Council of 1884 approved the Amendment of 1919, and Prohibition to boot. Clearly so, for Prohibition and anti-saloonism—to coin a hideous word—are synonyms. The ideas they express are alike in content and extension. Everybody knows that the pantry which holds a small flask of liquor is a saloon: that the nurse who hands an aged woman a glass of milk-punch is a bartender and that, by drinking the wicked concoction, the aged woman frequents the bar. Who needs to be told that saloon and anti-prohibition are synonymous? Nobody except the young, inexperienced and unenlightened Cardinal of Baltimore. Thank God for the dry and babbling Mr. Anderson. He is even now telling Catholics, his Holiness included, what the Pope can do in regard to the Mass. Thus the United States has the rare distinction of possessing a perambulating ecumenical council in full session, and in breeches and waistcoat and, perhaps, flowing sidewiskers. Something better than that, for Mr. Anderson is instructing the Pope. The blessing of

Issachar on Mr. Anderson's bonnie brow; but a truce to his licensed tongue, that is, if the American public would not miss the fun too much.

The Vision Realized

A FEW months ago a narrow line of blood and fire, that stretched across the continent of Europe, defined the battle area. Today the world itself has become the battlefield. What had been foretold by men of vision has happened. "Our men have gained immensely in self-respect, in personal discipline, in a wider comprehension of national and social issues," wrote Cardinal Bourne. They have faced death and the stern realities of the future life; they have conceived in their hearts a deep scorn of the politician and the profiteer; they have learned to be suspicious of official utterances and bureaucratic ways. The result of all this, as the Cardinal said, is "little short of revolutionary." A similar change was taking place in the minds of the munition-workers. "They, too, are questioning the whole system of society." Moreover, the men and women from the so-called higher classes of society, had for the first time come into relation and even into close comradeship with those whose acquaintance they never would have made in normal times. They also were readjusting their social views.

What had been so clearly foreseen has come to pass. The supreme significance of the labor unrest is not to be found in the Bolshevik reign of terror, the Spartacan uprisings and the outbreaks of violence in all parts of the world, though the news of these events is printed in flaring headlines in our daily local papers and fills the pages of the magazines and journals that periodically reach us from the distant antipodes. It is not in the sex war and the class war. All these are but transient manifestations, the work of ultra-radicals and extremists of every kind, who are the scum that must rise to the surface in times like these. Yet it is natural for men to turn their attention to these startling outbreaks rather than to the true causes of the unrest.

The latter were clearly pointed out in the Cardinal's message, to which we have alluded. It is for the recognition of the dignity of human nature itself that the workers are contending. They refuse to be mere cogs in an industrial machine, to live mainly for the sake of profits. It is no longer with them purely a question of wages and hours. As their spokesman recently said in submitting their declarations to the industrial parliament of England: "They are dissatisfied with the system of society which treats their labor power as a mere commodity, to be bought, sold and used as though they were machine-like units in the process of wealth production and distribution."

It is unfortunate that at this crisis Socialism should have attained to such a preponderance over the minds of the working classes. Its perverted ideas of a virtually universal State ownership, in place of that wider private distribution of property, agrarian and industrial, which

alone can avert the danger of a servile State, are certain to lead to economic disaster. Nor has either labor or capital risen as yet to a true and full comprehension of its responsibilities to the public in gaging standards of wages, of hours of labor and of profits. Great as ever is the danger of "the predatory use of power," unless the law and spirit of Christianity are accepted alike by both parties. Christian employers and laborers have therefore the duty of learning and enforcing, to the best of their power, the Christian solution of these momentous questions.

More Books, Fewer Movies

MANY parents, who read "A Mother's Reflections" in the Correspondence Department of this week's AMERICA, will be forced, no doubt, to give a sorrowful assent to what the writer says, apropos of the fact that so few of our Catholic boys and girls nowadays care to stay long enough at their books to secure a thorough education. From a study of the conditions prevailing in her little town in the Far West "F. M. P." has reached the conclusion that two important factors in the problem are "the amount of social 'life' pupils, beginning with the eighth grade, demand nowadays, and the movies" which, in the writer's opinion, "have created an abnormal desire for excitement, and a corresponding distaste for better, soberer things and especially for the grind which is necessary in the child trying to go through high school successfully."

Charles Hanson Towne in a short article he contributes to the March *Bookman* on "Juveniles and the Movies" bears similar testimony to the marked distaste that the small boys and girls of today, owing to their love of moving-pictures, have for such "old standbys" of his own childhood as "Little Lord Fauntleroy," "Alice in Wonderland," "Little Women," etc. "We like the movies much better than those silly books," was the considered verdict of a seven-year-old boy. The remark's significance gave Mr. Towne food for thought. He writes:

Children, in these crowded days—like their elders—have little time for contemplation, for character-analysis, for the rather slow-moving tales that used to hold us spellbound. Rather they want wild-west pictures, with excitement in every ten feet of film—and they get it.

So they are in no condition, he concludes, to be at all impressed by the "gentle books" that delighted the children of thirty years ago.

The evil now threatening the minds of the young, to say nothing of their morals, which is described in the foregoing paragraphs, is one that should cause Catholic parents grave concern. If the present generation of boys and girls owing to their immoderate addiction to "social life" and to their passion for the movies have no desire to read good books and if they find the classroom so irksome that they burn to give up school as soon as they possibly can, how shall we ever have the trained, re-

finer and educated laity of which the Church in this country stands in such need? Catholic parents, certainly cannot in conscience helplessly drift with the times and allow the minds of their children to be ruined by the

craze for amusement and dissipation to which the boys and girls of today are addicted. An admirable Lenten penance for these silly butterflies would be: More books, and fewer movies.

Literature

PADRAIC PEARSE

PADRAIC PEARSE, whose works are published by Frederick A. Stokes, was that most practical of all beings, an idealist. For it is surely a mistake to call that man practical who, because he recognizes certain things as impossible of achievement, refrains from attempting them; whereas to endeavor to give a working basis to one's dreams, so to live as though truth were true and justice sacred, and so die as though there were more ignoble things than death, is to be eminently practical and to carry logic to its uttermost conclusion. Pearse had the singleness of heart that is found in children and saints and fools, and something of childhood, something of sanctity, something of folly, shine through his written words as they were resplendent in his deeds.

It was the childlikeness of his own soul that drew him to children and gave him understanding of them, that made him familiar with the talk and the games of lads and the mothering ways of girls. He can show you the whimsical figure of Paraig in "The Priest," "letting on" to read the Mass in a chasuble contrived of an old blouse of his mother's, and he can make you shed tears over the grave of Barbara, though she be only a one-legged wooden doll. And for a delectable vision of temptation what could surpass that which meets the eye of Anthony as he sits on the master's fence and lets his gaze rove over his trim garden?

He saw a little, beautiful wee house under the shade of one of the rose-trees; it was made of wood; two stories in it; white color on the lower story and red color on the upper story; a little green door on it; three windows of glass on it, one downstairs and two upstairs; house furniture in it, between tables and chairs and beds and delf and the rest; and, says Anthony to himself, look at the lady of the house sitting in the door!

If you had a little sister sick at home and she without a doll, could you help "putting the covetousness of your heart" on the lady of that house?

But Pearse's knowledge of children did not stop at their games and toys; there is something terrifying about the way in which he shows their close contact with the supernatural, as in the story called "The Roads," which describes a storm of childish rebellion swelling to its bursting point in the heart of small Nora, left at home "to mind the child," so that she determines on carrying out the fine thoughts she has had of running away: "the roads of Ireland before her, and her face on them; the back of her head to home and hardship and the vexation of her people." Who but Pearse would show the little runaway a vision of Another going the roads, who else would unveil to the eyes of a lost child in a dark wood at night the Passion of the Son of Mary, until she cries out: "Let me go with You, Jesus, and carry Your cross for You."

In "Iosagan" it is the Holy Child Himself who plays among the village children, known to them by the Gaelic diminutive of His Holy Name, and seen only by their eyes and the eyes of Old Matthias. "I was too timid—or too proud—to go into Your House, Iosagan," falters the old man, long estranged from His service, "but I found You among the children." "There isn't any time or place that children do be amusing themselves that I am not along with them," explains Jesukin, and He adds, "My Father gave Me leave to show Myself to you because you loved His little children."

Perhaps Pearse's love for little children won for him some such gracious showing, for he was manifestly one of the Heaven-molested, who cannot escape from the supernatural. He may shape his song to a lullaby or to the praise of love, but the cradle song is half a *keen* and the love-song becomes a "Song for Mary Magdalene":

O woman with the wild thing's heart,
Old sin hath set a snare for thee;
In the forest ways forspent thou art,
But the hunter Christ shall pity thee.

O woman spendthrift of thyself,
Spendthrift of all the love in thee,
Sold unto sin for little pelf,
The captain Christ shall ransom thee.

It is the almost inevitable fate of a poet nowadays, especially if he is Irish, to be called a mystic, and happily there can be no hesitation in applying the term to Pearse. He does not belong, however, to the nebulous school of Yeats and Maeterlinck, but to the confident household of Ruysbroeck and Hildegard and Teresa of Jesus. On the one hand is the mystery of outer darkness, with the echo of the *stridor dentium* falling across its oracular cadences; on the other the ineffable mystery of faith. Take, for example, these lines on "The Coming of Christ":

I have made my heart clean tonight,
As a woman might clean her house
Ere her lover comes to visit her;
O Lover, pass not by!

I have opened the door of my heart
Like a man that would make a feast
For his son's coming home from afar:
Lovely Thy coming, O Son!

And the folly, how should it be manifest, for Padraic Pearse was a lover, and every lover worth the name is magnificently capable of folly. The world well lost is of the very essence of all love, human and Divine. How could it be different when the Beloved is she of the sorrows, for whom her lovers have been glad to die whether they called her Kathleen na Houlihan or Grainne Mhaol or the Little Dark Rose. For next to his Lord Padraic Pearse loved Ireland—perhaps it would be truer to say that his love for her was consequent upon his love for God. That is why the barefoot "small, wee children" were dear to him, that is why he sang "the little towns of Connacht," that is why there is so little difference between the lullaby of the mountain woman and her bitter keening. For this reason he bore himself proudly, as one who has set his love in high places:

I that have a soul greater than the souls of my people's
masters,
I that have vision and prophecy and the gift of fiery speech,
I that have spoken with God on the top of His holy hill.

And if he saw the light of the supernatural falling across even the children's playing he was no less aware that across his dreams and his songs fell the brightness of death's wing. A fool, he called himself plainly, "a fool that hath loved his folly." When in 1915 he wrote his play, "The Singer," his friends felt that in MacDara he had personified himself. "We thought it a foolish thing," says Diarmaid, "for fourscore to go into battle against four thousand, or maybe forty thousand." "And so it is a foolish thing," answers MacDara. "Do you want us to be wise?"

Oh, no, not wise; leave wisdom to the cabinet ministers and traffickers and counters of money, and suffer the dreamers of the world to keep their folly. And yet Pearse died with a question on his lips:

O wise men, riddle me this: what if the dream come true?
What if the dream come true? and millions unborn shall dwell
In the house that I shaped in my soul?

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

TO IRELAND

Amen. One greater trod the dolorous way:
Stamp of His crown is on thy queenly head,
And with thy wounded heart see His run red.
Be His thy trial; brave, though councils prey
On thirty coins. Thy truth fears not dismay,
For truth, though in white folly garmented,
Wears Him for seamless coat, who is not dead:
Pilate and Herod had their little day.

Arise. The morn is lit on Innisfail,
Brighter than dawns of olden poets' song
Through centuries of pain. Yea, comes again
An Easter morn to every loyal Gael;
Entombéd justice finds His truth is strong,
And He shall roll away the stone. Amen.

MICHAEL EARLS, S.J.

REVIEWS

Ireland's Case. By SEUMAS MACMANUS. New York: The Irish Publishing Co., P. O. Box 1300. \$1.15.

The Last Independent Parliament of Ireland. With Account of the Survival of the Nation and Its Lifework. By GEORGE SIGERSON, M. D. 5s.; **The Great Fraud of Ulster.** By T. M. HEALY, M. P. 2s. 6d. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

In good season for St. Patrick's Day come these three books on Ireland. Mr. MacManus's little volume, which is now in its fourth edition and thirty-fifth thousand, is a merciless indictment of English rule in Erin from Queen Elizabeth's time until today. The author supports his charges of tyrannical misgovernment with quotations, for the most part from Protestant writers, and England's deeds of oppression and injustice during the last four centuries are described with the bitter irony of a man who has himself experienced the effects of the Penal Laws, and

can vividly remember the queer questioning that started in my boyish mind one fierce February Sunday when, with the miserable multitude at Mass on that storm-lashed hillside [of Inver], our knees sunk in the marrow-freezing mire, our few sorry clothes soaked through and plastered to our bones by the snow-broth, our bared heads battered, and faces whipped and cut by the driving sleet, I heard the sagart (a simple saintly soul) lead us in supplication to the Lord to grant health and happiness to and shower His manifold blessings upon "Her Majesty, the Queen of this Realm, and all the Royal Family!"

Mr. MacManus maintains that every "concession" England has granted Ireland has been violently forced from her hand, that the country is still the prey of the British exploiter, and that even in our day the leopard has by no means changed its spots, but that, as Mrs. Green testifies, "The evils of the English conquest have never for a moment subsided; and they are at the present day almost as rife as they were 700 years ago." In his concluding pages the author examines the seven so-called "insuperable" obstacles to Ireland's freedom and shows how they can be overcome. "We want our country!" is Mr. MacManus's simple statement of Ireland's claims and the unbiased reader of this little book will have to own that there is no nation in the world that has a juster right to self-determination than Erin.

The two chief causes of Ireland's sorrows since her connection with England, says Dr. Sigerson, are "the instability of British Government in contrast with the stability of Irish character"

and England's "conquest-policy of treating colonies as serf-states." He tells how peace and prosperity came to Ireland during those few years at the close of the eighteenth century when the fear of a revolution forced England to allow the Irish Parliament actually to legislate in the interests of their own country, though that Parliament after all was not really a representative body, because the Catholics who made up about five-sixths of Ireland's population, had no voice in the deliberations. The author then describes the disgraceful means by which the "Union" was effected and dwells upon the horrors of the dragonades that provoked and followed the rebellion of '98. Those who expect the Irishmen of today to forget and forgive the wrongs of that time ask much of human nature. It is clear that no true Celt who knows the history of his country will ever cease struggling for her freedom. "The Great Fraud of Ulster" is a revised and abridged edition of the author's "Stolen Waters," a work which was reviewed in our issue of May 31, 1913. The waters in question are those of Lough Neagh and the river Bann, which have on their banks five northern counties of Ireland and the fisheries of which from immemorial ages until the year 1911 supplied with food many generations of hard-working Irishmen. When James I "planted" his Scots in Ireland, Chichester, his Lord Deputy, by forging documents appropriated the fisheries, but for three centuries, nevertheless, the natives still enjoyed their fishing rights, until Lord Shaftesbury succeeded nine years ago in securing a decision from the British House of Lords which robbed the Irish fishermen of their age-old means of livelihood. Mr. Healy, who was the Lough Neagh fishermen's chief lawyer in the case, shows how fraudulently the waters were seized and retained for three centuries by Chichester and his descendants, and as the author's narrative proceeds he throws many interesting sidelights on the history of England's long misgovernment of Ireland.

W. D.

The Eclipse of Russia. By E. J. DILLON. New York: George H. Doran Co. \$4.00.

The City of Trouble. By MERIEL BUCHANAN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.35.

Dr. Dillon's capacious analysis of the events and personalities that led up to the revolution of 1917 is a work rich in novel information on recent Russian affairs. The author seems well qualified to speak on matters Russian, having been a newspaper editor, professor, etc., for many years in Kiev, Moscow and Petrograd. One would feel the weight of his authority even more, were he not so careful to remind the reader of his credentials from time to time in the course of his narrative. The picture is not cheering, whether of Russia past or of Russia present. The strange, lurid light thrown on the character of the Russian peasantry by the author's description of the incredible religious sects that he so minutely investigated, the instances of fitfulness and "variability" which he notes as the universal feature of Russian character, the utter unfitness of either Czardom or *Intelligentsia* to lead the people out of their age-long plight, all make the reader pessimistic about the near future of Russia. Perhaps Dr. Dillon is unduly pessimistic. Dark as the picture is, others equally experienced have found it not altogether so hopeless as does this veteran journalist. In general, his book is a development of the opening sentences:

The misfortunes of Russia and the disillusion of the nations that trusted her promises and relied on her help are attributed to no one circumstance more markedly than the failure of the interested statesmen to grasp the purely predatory character of the Tsardom, its incompatibility with the politico-social ordering of latter-day Europe, the pressing necessity on the one hand and the almost insuperable difficulty on the other of remodeling and adapting it to its European environment. It is no exaggeration to affirm that the history of drifting Europe—excluding the Central Empires—

during the past quarter of a century, and of the outbreak of the awful struggle at its close, is the story of a tissue of deplorable mistakes.

Coupled with his accusation of the *Intelligentsia* as quite deceived, and deceiving the Allied nations, in their pretense to read the "soul of the people," is Dr. Dillon's drastic denunciation of the Czarism as a mixture of petty perfidy and predatory selfishness. He lays the guilt of the revolution itself on the Czarism, which in a hundred ways had fostered revolutionary practices for its own ends. Even the Hague Convention he attributes in its origin to a Czarist plot to hoodwink Austria. The one hope of Russia as she was he finds to have been in Sergius Witte. With all of Witte's defects, he was the one figure, in Dr. Dillon's opinion, who could effect the transition from the horrors of Czarist autocracy to some form of self-government, since his policy, of gradually introducing reforms, while still keeping the power of the autocracy, was the sole safeguard against revolutionary bitterness on the one hand, and centrifugal excesses on the other. Throughout the book the commanding figure of Witte stands out in strong relief against the intriguing and shallow person of the Czar, his thankless master.

Miss Buchanan's straightforward narrative of experience as an eye-witness of the Russian Revolution, for she is the daughter of Sir George Buchanan, the last British Ambassador at Petrograd, is an apt sequel to Dr. Dillon's ruminations. Her story is direct and vivid, from the days that immediately preceded the war, through the Kerensky revolution, to the final reign of terror under the Bolsheviks. Almost every phase of these tremendous days came in some way under her ken. It is just this sort of document which will live long after many weightier speculations have had their day. The feeling of impending disaster which is so subtly indicated in her opening description of the "Evening Review at Krassnoe" finds its justification in the series of heart-rending scenes which follow; the touching account of the young soldier-patients in the Petrograd hospital, the confusion and misery of the people, and the ever-growing tyranny of that Bolshevik power which Dr. Dillon describes as "Czarism upside down."

J. LAF.

The People of Action: A Study in American Idealism. By GUSTAVE RODRIGUES. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.50.

Here is a book which Americans will open with keen curiosity. It is another attempt, on the part of a European, to evaluate us. Written by a cultured Frenchman, it is, of course, guaranteed against the extravagances of the Dickens portrait on the one hand, and the heavy, if true, delineation of Bryce's "American Commonwealth," on the other. Clarity and order, we have come to expect from the French, and certainly expectations are realized here.

The book is divided into five parts in which are embraced every important phase of American life: the conditions of our existence, our ideals, individual, national, international, and finally a section which is, perhaps, best described as the philosophy of American idealism. For here, by an ingenious theory are reconciled the two members of the volume's paradoxical title: "The People of Action" and "A Study in American Idealism." Here too, perhaps, is to be found, for the American reader, the completest satisfaction in the book. Instinctively, we draw our own portrait as people of action; yet no American who has seen our youth go forward to die for an ideal could ever be satisfied with a national portrait from which idealism had been excluded. Some intrinsic compatibility between the two qualities there surely was, and Mr. Rodrigues in this section has laid it bare. The physical America, he tells us, was discovered by Columbus. Most Europeans never discovered any more, and so the legend of the "dollar-mad Yankee" arose; a legend in which Germany was steeped to her own destruction.

America's soul was displayed with President Wilson. And thus, concludes the author, "America has been twice discovered."

On the whole the author has drawn a flattering picture, though of course shadow as well as light is present. Exception, too, could well be taken to some of the detail: his remarks, for example, on religious idealism, his too great admiration for Henry James, and the statement, happily false, that every American woman is a feminist. Yet it would be ungenerous to bring into prominence the blemishes of a portrait which for the most part is so sympathetic and so true.

G. B.

The English Village. A Literary study; 1750-1850. By JULIA PATTON, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$1.50.

This interesting book, which seems to be the work submitted by the author for her degree, shows that Dr. Patton first made herself thoroughly familiar with what British poets and prose-writers have written about the English village from 1750 to 1850. She digested the material well and then presented it in a very readable form. The chapter describing the transition of the village from its medieval to its modern character, however, appears to neglect the important place the Catholic Church had in the villager's daily life. Regarding the economic revolution that followed the change of religion in England, the author writes: "Poverty increased, and at the closing of the monasteries the State was obliged to take over from the Church the care of its poor and then was inaugurated that system of poor-relief," which reached its heartless climax in the nineteenth century. For the evil of "inclosure" let the grasping landlord rob the helpless cottagers of their rights and made them laborers without property. Their unavoidable poverty was regarded as a crime and their wretched life often ended in that minor glory of the English Reformation, the workhouse.

Goldsmith, Crabbe, John Scott, Cowper, Burns, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Ebenezer Elliott, Bloomfield, Clare, Barnes, Cobbett, Hogg, Hardy and Washington Irving are the chief writers whose descriptions of village-life suggest to the author her discerning reflections, and her quotations are very apt. In a concluding chapter entitled "Looking Forward," Dr. Patton briefly reviews the changes that have taken place in the English village since 1850, and wonders what further changes the war now ending will bring.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Father M. M. English's "The Case of Ireland" (Murphy-Cheely Printing Co., Butte, Mont., \$0.10) is a timely and forcible pamphlet. He reviews the age-long struggle of the Celts to possess their own country, recalls America's indebtedness to Irish-born patriots in Revolutionary days when Joseph Gallo-way, an uncompromising Loyalist, attested before a committee of the House of Commons that "about one-half" of the Continental army were Irishmen, proves from the Pigott forgeries the London *Times'* attitude toward Ireland, draws up a statement of that sorrowful land's present position, quoting very effectively George Russell's letter to Rudyard Kipling, and ends with a strong plea for Irish freedom. The excellent sermon on "The Mission of St. Patrick," which the Rt. Rev. Mgr. O'Riordan preached at Rome last March, has been published by M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin.

"The Day's Burden" (Scribner's)—Readers of the leading English reviews will be pleased to learn that the economic, political and literary essays of the late Lieutenant Thomas Kettle have been reprinted and now appear in permanent form under the above title. In addition to the collection of essays first published in book-form in 1910 are several studies contributed to periodicals between 1910 and the outbreak of the war. The two essays on labor published in the *Dublin Review* on the occasion of the great Dublin strike of 1914 make very timely

reading during the present industrial unrest as they contain the sound Christian principles which alone can bring peace into the two warring camps of capital and labor.—During the war we witnessed in America, as elsewhere, a nationwide turning to prayer. "Whence Cometh Victory" (John Murphy Co., \$0.50) by Mary B. Littleton, establishes in prayer the "great natural law of victory" and advocates official registration and remembrance for those—"the greatest of the war workers"—who participated in our crusade of prayer for victory. The author explains why the Vatican is the peace palace of the world while the Hague is empty. By citing examples of the faith of military conquerors in every age and of the influence of prayer in other wars the author rounds out an interesting treatment of a subject which our gratitude should make important.—In "God's Responsibility for the War," (Macmillan, \$0.60) by Edward S. Drown, D. D., "God is on trial for His life." The charge is suggested by the title, and the author appears as a not very convincing counsel for the defendant. He rejects his best appeal—inscrutability and then tries to prove the impossible, that if God could prevent man's evil actions, man would not be free. Intent on the contradiction he thinks he sees here, the author falls into a real ditch in his solution. He allows man—a creature—a being essentially and totally dependent on God to be in very many acts entirely independent. A complete treatise on natural theology would be needed to correct the author's vagaries.

Father E. R. Hull, S. J., the editor of the *Bombay Examiner*, who has recently been contributing a trenchant series of articles to his paper on "Rewritten English History," now means to take up the subject "in earnest" and asks the help of all teachers of the branch in schools and colleges. He writes:

There are dozens of English history text-books in use which contain numbers of points that Catholic teachers object to, and most teachers will have copies with the plates marked or annotated. If we can get hold of these, we shall be able to make a list of points which need treating controversially. But do not at once send us copies of the books. Kindly inform us that you are using (or have used) such and such books, and can send us a copy with places marked if asked for. This will economize work, and will prevent the sending of several copies of the same volume from different quarters. Teachers who have made a careful note of the defects complained of are asked specially to put themselves co-operatively at our service in this way.

Perhaps there is no living writer who has done more than Father Hull to force the lying Protestant tradition to retire time and again from its strongly intrenched position in the field of history. In the new campaign he is now opening he should get all the assistance he needs.

In his introduction to Rollo Ogden's faithful translation of the "Maria" (Harper) of Jorge Isaacs, Thomas A. Janvier did well to remind the reader that American literature was born in the Spanish colonies, that the first book printed on this continent was a Spanish book, and that it antedated the "Bay Psalm Book" by three years more than a century. In every one of the Spanish colonies from Mexico to Chile and Peru, letters flourished. In Colombia few names are more popular than that of Jorge Isaacs, the child of an English Jew and a Spanish mother. Every Colombian has read his "Maria," and in the pictures the author draws of Colombian scenery, life, customs and manners, recognizes the touch of a master, of one who transcribes from life the scenes which he paints. "Maria" is the romance of the pure and tender love of Efrain for the fair and virtuous Maria, of Efrain's departure for England to make his name and his fortune, of the maid's sudden illness and death before the boy's return. A trifle, it is true, but a tale unfolded with wonderful simplicity, delicacy, truth, feeling, and reserve, against the background of the life and virtues

of a truly Christian home. Only one fault perhaps can be found, an overstressed tone of melancholy that reminds the reader of the style of Chateaubriand and the sentimental school of the beginning of the nineteenth century.—"Amalia, a Romance of the Argentine" (Dutton \$2.00), translated from the Spanish of José Mármol, by Mary J. Serrano, is an historical romance which gives a vivid picture of the reign of terror which prevailed under the Dictator Rosas. It is plainly not in sympathy with the Federals and gives a harrowing description of the unavailing efforts made by Daniel Bello and his associates to restore freedom to the unhappy country, and traces the reason for the failure to the refusal on the part of the patriots to submerge individual interests in the common good. The story is well told and carefully translated, but it is a little too prolix in treatment and complex in construction to satisfy altogether the modern taste.

Those who have been following the fortunes of the *Bookman* must own that that magazine has never been more readable than now, with the George H. Doran Company as its publishers. The March number is particularly good, for Christopher Morley tells delightfully how "Titania Arrives" at Roger Mifflin's bookshop, D. Thomas Curtin describes "Hindenburg's March Into London" as it was to have been, Mrs. Kilmer contributes a poem on "My Mirror," Kate Dickinson Sweetser describes the dinner at Delmonico's given to Dickens in 1868, Robert C. Holliday has an entertaining account of what "Hunting Hack Work" is like, "The Complaint Department" contains a very amusing revelation by Thomas L. Masson concerning the best-sellers he has never read, the "Gossip Shop" continues to lure the reader on, Carolyn Wells's "When the Bookman Turned" is full of gnomic wit, and Margaret Widdemer pictures "A Poet in Paradise" thus:

Surely in some old room in heaven,
By some celestial fire,
He who loved fires and friendship so
Still keeps his heart's desire.

And Herrick leans and laughs with him
Along their bench of gold,
While Chaucer murmurs leisurely
Some blithe old tale untold.

O surely while the flames leap high
As Syrian watchfires blew,
King David comes to speak with him
Of wars and songs they knew.

Or down the meads of paradise
Where God's true gallants ride,
He speaks of love and honor now
To Lovelace at his side.

But when at eve by Heaven's gate
The blessed souls keep ward,
I think he waits where Beatrice
Walks with her dark-cowled lord.

And looking down, where one green star
Lies in the sky's deep dome,
"And was it long," he asks of her,
"Before your love came home?"

Among the little books of piety recently published is a new edition of Father Garesché's "Your Neighbor and You" (Benziger, \$0.75), a good series of papers on practical holiness which originally formed a volume of the *Messenger's* fifty-cent library.—Father Hagspiel has compiled a manual of devotions entitled "Thy Kingdom Come!" (Mission Press, Techny, \$0.25), for the spread of Christ's Kingdom upon earth. The neatly bound booklet should be of interest to the Faithful in general, but will be particularly welcome, no doubt, to the newly founded mission societies and clubs.—Paul Dudon has translated from Italian into French a pamphlet now entitled

"*L'Action de Benoit XV Pendant la Guerre*" (Beauchesne, 1 fr.), the English version of which is familiar to our readers as "The Pope's War Work" (America Press, \$0.10; \$7.00 a hundred). This record of the Holy Father's success in mitigating the horrors of the recent conflict should be scattered far and wide.—The Examiner Press of Bombay has published an excellent little book of ascetical studies by Alban Goodier, S.J., under the title of "The School of Love and Other Essays." It is written in that attractive style, and with that spiritual insight, which has already won for the author a circle of devoted readers. He goes into the byways of the life of the spirit, analyzing some of those flaws of character, which in spite of their practical universality usually escape treatment, pointing out some of those aspirations of the soul, which from ignorance seldom reach fruition, and suggesting ways for advance in the love of God, especially through the practice of prayer.

EDUCATION

Is the Ostracism of Greek Practicable?

THIS "mosaic of etymology" which I offer is not, I think, simply an ingenuous *tour de force*. It has a significance and a practical value. It may illustrate the composite nature of the English language; it may amuse a curious reader; it may enliven a Greek class with the touch of actuality; it may disclose dim vistas into the distant past through the medium of everyday language, exemplifying history through common things, a lesson which Dr. Salmon of Vassar has often taught in her classes and published lectures. All the words of this phantasy are of Greek origin, except the article, the pronouns, the prepositions and conjunctions, and a few other small words: "so, as, then, home, let, go, do, all," and parts of the verb "to be." Skeat's Etymological Dictionary (Student's edition) is the authority. The exclusively technical words of modern sciences, which are almost wholly Greek, have not, for the most part, been mentioned. It is needless to remark that the prescriptions of the phantom's pharmacy are not authoritative.

THE OPENING DECLARATION

DURING a period of lethargy I was petrified at a phantom, bounding from my lexicon, with this cataract of phrases:

"Are you Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Catholic, or Christian? Without me, you were anonymous. Do you stigmatize heresy and schism, hypocrisy and blasphemy? Do you blame schemers against the Mosaic decalog? Do you impose anathemas on apostates, idolaters and atheists or exorcise the devil and his demons with their diabolical pomps? Are you zealous for proselytes, and to baptize neophytes after catechism, and to canonize orthodox martyrs with halos and emblems, scandalizing frenzied iconoclasts? Then all that is done through me.

The ecclesiastical sphere is practically mine. I am the architect of churches, cathedrals and basilicas, from the asphalt base in the crypts of the catacomb, up to the apse and the chimes in the dome. I am architect of monasteries for monks and anchorites, and of asylums for orphans and lepers and maniacs. Mine is the Hierarchy, from the Pope on his dais with his tiara, to the mitered Bishop in his diocese, and to the parish priest in his presbytery. Deacons and acolytes, clergy and laity, Papal encyclicals, diocesan synods, parochial homilies, and all dogmatic theology, with its mysteries and myriad topics, are mine. The Bible is mine from Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy of the Pentateuch, to Paralipomenon and the Psalms, to patriarchs and prophets, to the Evangelists of Christ, to the Epistles and Apocalypse of His Apostles. Epiphany, Pentecost, the Parasceve are mine. The tunes of the hymns, the quiring of the anthems, the Gregorian tones of the litanies and antiphons are melodious through me, and I composed the canon and the liturgy with its symbols.

DOMESTIC USES

GO to your home with me. Bushels of anthracite for the chimney, and a diet of fancied nectar! Chairs and plates and dishes; oysters; butter and treacle; perch or trout or sardines, in olive oil; the aroma of capon or partridge or pheasant; celery and asparagus and peppers; cherries and dates and currants; citrons and melons, prunes and quinces and plums; pumpkins, marmalade and pastry; chestnuts and pippins; masses of purple hyacinths, with lily and crocus, with geraniums and heliotropes, with narcissus and peony, with asters and orchids and posies of roses. What zest! Isn't that a panorama of paradise to tantalize you? Be not economical or dyspeptic. Masticate beneath your moustache. Let choruses echo in the parlor with music of organ and guitar, or let there be anecdotes on the piazza around a bottle of cheering tonic.

I telephone or telegraph for my "auto," and my machine goes to my theater or hippodrome. There is on my program the symphony orchestra with harmonious melodies. Or on my program are scenes melancholy with tragedy, or hilarious with pantomime and melodrama, with comic monolog or dramatic dialog, with cyclists, gymnasts and acrobats. After the drama or kinematic photography, with match and lamp you go to attic canopies, and to the climes of Morpheus. For all these you are to reimburse me with the treasures of the purse.

SEA AND LAND AND POLITICS

GO with me to the ocean, opposing the stratagems and tactics of barbarous pirates, to meander by gulf and isthmus and archipelago, nomads through all climates, charting geography with my nautical atlases, from the Arctic to the Antarctic through the tropic zone, from Polynesia to its antipodes. Then for my astronomy! What a panorama through my telescope in the crystal atmosphere! Above the horizon in the empyrean are my planets and comets and meteors and galaxies of asteroids.

Without me where is your "zoo" with its panthers and leopards, with dolphin and crocodile and hippopotamus, with lynxes and hyenas, with ostrich and pelican, with buffalo and dromedary, with ichneumons and scorpions, with the gigantic elephant and its proboscis and the pygmy squirrel! Or what of my chimerical and utopian "zoo," with the phenix and dragon and griffins and chameleons and gorgons and gnomes and basilisks and sphinxes and hybrids!

But I am not archaic; the scope of my dynamic energy is practical and not eccentric. Mine are politics, the diadems of monarchs, the scepters of tyrants, barbarous anarchy and despotic autocracy, the panics of demagogues and the parliaments of autonomy and democracy. Chemistry and chemical analysis, physics with its phenomena of electricity, acoustics and optics, mechanics, botany, geology, entomology and all the "-ologies" with their technical glossaries; they are mine.

APOTHECARIES, SCHOOLS, AND ESSAYISTS

SO are all the apothecaries and pharmacies with glycerine and licorice and creosote and the antidotes for quinsy; for catarrh, dropsy, neuralgia and for every "-itis" and "-osis"; emetics for the stomach; the cathartics, calomel and castor-oil; doses of paregoric for colic; plasters for imposthumes; arsenic for spasms of epilepsy, and tonics for anemic arteries; a peptonoid diet for dysentery; oxygen against bronchial phlegm; bromides for asthma; iodine for pleurisy and parasites; narcotics to calm hysteria; antipyrin for agonizing rheumatism; antitoxins for diphtheria and for the deleterious microbes of cholera or typhoid, and bottles of panaceas.

Anatomy is mine and the surgeon, diagnosing symptoms, charting septic organs on diagrams, trepanning the cranium, cauterizing for hemorrhage, is mine; so are his sponges and syringes and silk and his styptics, and his prophylactic hygiene, and his

anesthetics, chloroform and ether, and his antiseptics against bacteria and gangrene, and his autopsy and his skeletons.

The school is mine with its desks, its programs and schedules, and the scholars, from their alphabet to their diploma, their arithmetic and geometry, their gymnasiums and athletics and the school diamond and amphitheater. Pause before you ostracize me from my schools.

Would you be an essayist, sketching graphic stories or typical characters; an historian, cataloging the treasures of archives and chronicling epochs of catastrophe and calm; or a philosopher, systematizing theories of Stoics, Hedonists, Peripatetics and Scholastics; or a poet, composing idylls and madrigals, lyrics and odes with strophes and the epics with episodes, you are mine. Without me you have not talents or ideas or paper or ink. Mine are your grammar and syntax, your syllables, your paragraphs with their commas and colons and parentheses, your lexicons and encyclopedias and card-catalogs, your topics and themes for ecstatic rhapsodies or for austere logic, your fantastic paradoxes and your idiotic theories. 'Tis I who phrase for you your axioms, caustic criticisms, laconic epigrams, all your irony and sardonic sarcasm. If your technique is idiomatic, your methods puzzling or crystal, your tropes and metaphors graphic, your fancies hectic or anemic, you are mine. I am your enthusiastic stenographer, jotting down and synopsisizing your ideas and typing them to be stereotyped in your authentic tomes, whether anonymous or under a pseudonym.

AND A FINAL APOLOGY

I APOLOGIZE for my tautologies, for this monotonous labyrinth, for the phalanx of technicalities and for the etymological mosaic which strangles your larynx with "ics" and "isms." Whether it is all abysmal bathos, or the climax and acme of the practical, I am to blame for it.

But pause before you ostracize me from my schools; pause ere the nemesis of chaos and disaster is yours; but if you are to be characterized as adamant and without sympathy, let the poets echo a threnody about my coffin; let there be a chorus of paeans under the cypress and cedar, the larch and osier, the myrtle and amaranth, about my cenotaph; let there be in my cemetery a mausoleum with a monolith, and on it my epitaph:

The Lexicons of Europe Are the Trophies of Greece.

FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S.J.

ECONOMICS

A Railroad Gild

THE four largest railroad brotherhoods have offered a remarkable plan to settle the railroad question. They suggest government ownership of the railroads, purchased at their physical valuation, and an equal division of earnings between the employees and the Government. The second main feature of their plan is to democratize industry by cooperative management.

They are tired of capitalistic ownership and control. They know it well. They know that a few men own the railroads and their industries, while still fewer control them. They know that they themselves are propertyless. They have their labor unions, but they know what perpetual haggling they have to undergo, how their labor unions have their severely defined limits, and how they have to walk into the danger of a strike every few years. They know that they are in subjection to the owners of industry, except for what limited help their unions can give. They look about, and see weaker unions than theirs, and vast bodies of the unorganized workmen. They know how stunted their own lives are and they wonder at the conditions of the unorganized. They have drawn close to capitalism, too close, often, to express precisely what capitalism is, but they know that it is hideous. And

whether right or wrong, the only way they see to rid themselves of the control of the capitalist is to have the State the owner of the railroads.

WHAT ITS WORKERS PLAN

But they do not want merely to exchange the control of the capitalists for the control of the State. The State is stronger, and they are afraid their subjection will be deeper. They know that they cannot expect to control, or even influence deeply and continuously, the politically appointed director of the railroads. He is too far away from them, almost as far as, and with more power than the railroad owners who have inherited their wealth from dead "builders of empire." They are encouraged to bargain collectively; but they know that if they threaten to support collective bargaining with the strike, against the will of the appointed political director, they can be clapped into prison or shot down. And somehow they feel that such subjection is very close to slavery, and that, perhaps, it will become slavery, after a time, for themselves and their fellow-workers.

So they have to seek for relief elsewhere. Since they cannot rely on such things, poor at best, as collective bargaining and political control, they ask for so superb a thing as self-government in industry. Rather, they modify self-government with a minority representation of the State. They ask for a managing corporation to direct the railroads. They want the employees to elect one-third of the directors of the managing corporation; the officials and employees together to elect a second third; and they would have the President appoint the final third. They want this board to control the railroads. Instead of political democracy, they choose economic democracy for industry. They are against the control of the capitalist. They are against the control of the politician. In place of them, they will have a republic of industry. But to spoil it all, they ask for so poor a thing as State ownership, and so paltry a thing as half of the earnings.

THE WITCHERY OF "STATE SOCIALISM"

They are bewitched by State Socialism, that shadow of Socialism, the reflection of Socialism that "through the looking-glass" somehow takes topsy-turvy shape as public capitalism. They who have the strongest of labor unions, give such bad example to the other workers as to ask for State ownership. They have the wisdom and courage to ask for democratic management of the railroads. They realize that the settlement of the railroad problem is going to have a deep influence upon the whole problem of labor and capital, and that their example will be followed. They ask for State ownership; their folly will be just as contagious. They will see a whole system of State ownership grow from the dragon's teeth they sow. They will see a State guarantee of capital's earnings, where there is no State ownership, and the whole system will mean black harm. The same distribution of wealth as today, will be had. The owners of the bonds will get their workless incomes. They and the rest of the workers will find themselves toiling away to pay the interest on the bonds, if there is State ownership, or the direct profits, where industries are still in private hands. They will have to keep up the property in one way or another. They will have to provide, in one way or another, for a sinking fund. Their half of the earnings will vanish. They will find themselves still working for a bare living. Yes, they will find themselves and their fellow-workers throughout all industry forced to work for the profits of the few owners of industry. What if they "control" then, the industry? It will be mere self-government within the limits of economic subjection to the owners of industry. They will still be a caste, apart. They will still be in the toils of the wage-system. They will come back to the control of the capitalists they have fled, and the control of the political representatives of capitalism.

A MORE PERFECT PLAN

If they have the courage to ask for self-government in industry and the renewal of capitalist control, why do they not ask to own the railroads themselves, and not the State? Why do they not ask for all the earnings? They can get all the earnings by having all the workers owning, privately, shares in the railroads. Instead of a managing corporation, the Government can form a holding and managing corporation, that would both manage the railroads, and hold the stock in the railroads. The holding company would buy up, gradually but not too slowly, the railroads of the country at their physical valuation. It would sell the new stock in the railroads, held by the holding and managing corporation, to the railroad workers themselves and to their unions. The Government could extend good terms, easy payments, long-time loans. The earnings of the railroads would be theirs. Every engine-flue and desk would be theirs. Moreover if the railroad workers would push their plan, amended to include wide private ownership, it would give such an impetus to the efforts of the middle class and the propertyless workers that we could expect it to be, at no far-distant date, the rule in industry. It would break down capitalism. It would take the very foundation from under Socialist agitation, for it is capitalism and a mass of propertyless workers, that breeds communistic yearnings. It would break down that other danger, too, State Socialism and its slavery.

And were private ownership in the industrial means of production the possession of the determining majority of the workers, and were access given it to all the workers, we would see a new world. It would not be a perfect world. But we would see wide-spread happiness and real independence among the workers. We would see the rebirth of the gild. There is no need of waiting a long time to begin the institution of a nation of small-property owners. We can start now to help build up a nation of self-governing industrial republics of property-owning workers.

R. A. MCGOWAN.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Pope's Message to Labor

AT a recent audience granted to the delegates of a Catholic organization, largely constituted of workmen, the Holy Father, according to a wireless received by the New York World, expressed his sympathy with the aspirations of labor throughout the world. Of particular interest is the promise he is said to have given that he would help to obtain a betterment of labor conditions, which he realized must be the special task of the next few years. "I intend," he said, "to follow the policy of Leo XIII and will disclose my program later, meanwhile I want the workers of the entire world to know that I am their friend." These expressions are interpreted as signifying the Pope's determination to lead the new spirit of the age in aiding to make a better world by bettering labor conditions.

Y. M. C. A. a "Part of the Protestant Church"

AT a dinner given by the Y.M.C.A. to the Protestant clergy of St. Louis, one of the speakers frankly stated, as the *Western Watchman* of that city reports in its issue for February 7, that: "The Y.M.C.A. is part of the Church (the Protestant Church of course) and the Church is part of the Y.M.C.A." There is nothing in this confession that was not perfectly known before, but it is well to have it so clearly and candidly set down. The Y.M.C.A. is not merely a strictly Protestant organization devoted to the work of Protestant propaganda at home, but is one of the foremost contributors to the Protestant mission cause abroad. The Y. M. C. A., as the preacher succinctly expressed the fact, is a part of the Protestant Church. The current com-

ments upon this organization to be found in any Protestant organ would absolutely confirm this statement did it call for confirmation. The deductions to be drawn are obvious. No one can find fault with the familiar rule forbidding Catholics to hold any responsible position in this society, but we must more than pity the Catholic who has so little self-respect as to join an organization "in which he is regarded as belonging to an inferior caste," and which is part of a Church opposed to his own.

The Last Laugh

A GENTLE creature who in a wild moment fancied that he knew enough ethics to satirize it, once wrote a letter to AMERICA on Prohibition and sent along with his communication, a tender little note asking that his reflections, which he thought highly amusing, be inserted. His wish was granted and an uproar followed, for his friends, the virtuous by statute and lecturers on the evils of alcohol at fifty dollars apiece, were indignant at his apostasy from the high and noble cause of lemonade and ginger-snaps. Forthwith he proclaimed himself merely a jester, busy at his bells, and the Prohibitionists laughed merrily. Under skilful instruction they began to see humor in the situation, but not all heard on time of the kittenish sally and as a consequence, the lightsome pages of their reviews from Florida to New York denounced the poor actor so vehemently that he has been obliged to write an explanation of his jest, a sorry plight for an Irishman, in very truth, but a splendid work for a Kentish landlord or a London Tory. But this would-be satirist should not be discouraged for a greater man than he, Daniel Webster, was so little appreciated that Sidney Smith declared that his wit was like the frisking of an elephant. It is ever true that he who laughs last laughs best.

Methodism in Japan

THE obligations of the American branch of the Methodist Church to Methodism in Japan have been carefully canvassed and have been included in the Missionary Centenary budget of \$40,000,000 for the foreign missions, says the *Christian Advocate*. Reduced to definite figures the Methodist Centenary proposals for Japan contemplate the erection of forty-six new churches, ten parsonages, twelve mission houses and residences, one high school, one Christian college and one publishing house. A further total of eighteen additional missionaries, eighty-one native preachers and eighteen native teachers is also included in the comprehensive Centenary plan. It is in this definite and business-like method that Protestantism achieves its results. The field is surveyed, the needs are tabulated, the amount of money required is estimated and the offerings to be given are carefully apportioned among the various American communities so that each congregation may contribute according to its means.

Highest Testimonies for the K. of C.

COUNTLESS letters of recognition and appreciation are being received by the Knights of Columbus. Some of these are from persons high in authority and best qualified to pronounce upon the excellent character of the work accomplished by the Knights. Thus Major Gen. Grote Hutcheson, writing from Headquarters, Fourteenth Division, Camp Custer, Michigan, says:

I have noticed with a great deal of personal satisfaction, the capable and efficient manner in which the various huts pertaining to the Knights of Columbus have been administered and operated in this camp by your organization, and I desire thus to make of record my appreciation of the good work your organization has done in this camp to help fill in the leisure time of our soldiers, in a helpful and beneficial manner to them.

And Major Harding Polk, of the General Staff, Headquarters, Seventeenth Division, Camp Beauregard, Louisiana, expresses his desire personally to thank the Knights for the excellent work of their organization at this camp, and then adds:

Both before and since the armistice was signed, it has been a great factor in maintaining the morale of the men. Upon the occasion of each of my visits to the Knights of Columbus hall I found a great many men present, either reading or writing. I consider the size of the attendance at each of your four services on Sunday remarkable. These facts speak for themselves.

I have observed the work of the Knights of Columbus at this camp, in various parts of the United States, and in many parts of France. I have heard nothing but good of it. They can justly be proud of this record.

There is no one among men or officers who will not heartily subscribe to this testimony. Surely to have achieved such success was well worth all the toil and sacrifice.

De Valera on the Priests of Ireland

THE following glorious tribute to the Irish clergy occurs in "Letters from Ireland and from Lincoln Jail, England," by the Irish leader, Professor Eamon De Valera. It is part of an interview given to an American press representative.

Clerical domination! How little they think who use that phrase of what a tremendous tribute it is to the Irish priests. What is the secret of the priest's influence with the people? It is nothing but the recognition by the people of a truth that in Ireland the priests have been what ministers of religion should be everywhere, the fathers and guides of their flocks. In Ireland the priests have always stood beside the people, comforting, encouraging and helping them in dark days—their safest, most unselfish, often their only leaders. Let the Protestant minister by similar deeds secure similar influence over his people, no Catholic will seek to diminish it. Would you deprive a minister of religion, because he is such, of his rights as a citizen, and of his influence as a man, an educated man, a good man? Would you rob him of the secular influence that traditional service has merited for his cloth? Finally, should we not be honest with ourselves and recognize that if religion is not a mere pretense with us, it is the most important thing in life, and should influence our every action? It is not something to be put outside the backdoor whenever we choose. A minister of religion then, if he is at all a worthy one, is entitled to special regard as such, and his advice has a special value even in what might be considered very mundane affairs.

In their desire to avoid greater evils, the clergy, he thought, might at times have been shortsighted in their counsels, becoming "rather too severe a break for a naturally conservative people," and obtaining "for a *de facto* Government an obedience owed only to a *de jure* one." In the present trying times, however, the Irish priests have surely shown themselves sound both in head and in heart, true pastors of their people.

Faithful Ireland

THE Rt. Rev. Mgr. O'Riordan, Rector of the Irish College, Rome, in a sermon he preached last St. Patrick's Day, pays this tribute to the steadfast faith of his countrymen:

And their supernatural life has become also the mainstay of their national life. The soul of a nation can never die, except of moral corruption. Brute force may grind to powder the material elements that compose it, but if it rests on the moral law it will revive and put out its activity again. A nation that lives in God, lives by purity, by justice, by fortitude, by hope. It may have to pass through its winter of bleak distress; but its spring and summer are sure to come round, and it will bloom again like every tree that grows. That leads us into the secret of this striking fact. By the middle of the eighteenth century, the Catholics of Ireland had been reduced to about two-thirds of the popu-

lation. By the middle of the nineteenth they were in a majority of six to one. In spite of the consequence of the Famine of 1847—a famine not because there was not food, but because it was taken from those who produced it, and under the sanction of the law—in spite of wholesale evictions, of the dispersion of families, and other causes of the continuous depopulation which has been going on for the past seventy years till now, the Catholics are still in a majority of three to one. There has been a systematic design to destroy the race; and yet the race lives on. There may be more than one cause of that striking phenomenon, but the chief one has its root in the faith of the people. The teaching of the Divine Motherhood of Our Blessed Lady, which St. Patrick took to Ireland as it came fresh from the Council of Ephesus; the ideal of her virginal purity, which that teaching stamped on the souls and hearts of the women of Ireland; reverence for the sanctity of the marriage state; these have saved Irish Catholics from those two growths of our fashionable civilization—the divorce court and the suicide of race. Their faith has saved them from that filth. Their faith is not a mere philosophy; it is a life. They live by their Catholic Faith; they hold by their national ideals which that Faith has helped them to form and to keep. And they have never been forgiven for it—no, not from the day when Giraldus Cambrensis lied in the twelfth century, to the politician and the news-correspondent who lie today, and lie without scruple and without shame.

Since the commanding position held today in the United States by the Catholic Church is so largely due to the rich heritage of faith and purity we have received from the Irish race, the feast of St. Patrick should be observed as a sort of Thanksgiving Day.

State Ownership in North Dakota

THE most extensive system of State ownership ever yet attempted in America is to be put into immediate operation in North Dakota. The complete control of the State Government by the Non-Partisan League has made this possible. The laws introducing the new plan have been signed by the Non-Partisan Governor, Lynn Frazier, and a commission of three men is to meet within about a week from our date of publication to make effective a system of State banking, elevators, mills and markets, together with a State-operated farm and home-loan business. A special dispatch from Bismarck, N. D., to the *New York Sun* gives these further details of the new venture:

Gov. Frazier will head the committee, which is empowered under the new laws to select sites, acquire property, establish rules for operating the businesses, employ and discharge employees and fix salaries. The commission will assume management of all public utilities now authorized and those to be established. It is further empowered to establish new State industries as accessories to the milling and marketing activities. Packing houses and public markets are some of the optional industries.

Establishment of the elevators is provided for by permission given to the commission to make a \$5,000,000 bond issue, and permission also has been given for a \$10,000,000 issue for farm loans. The new State bank will have a capital of \$2,000,000 and State deposits of \$60,000,000. Lower interest rates are promised.

This violent reaction against the capitalistic system is due to the serious grievances inflicted by railroads, speculators, loan-sharks and capitalistic corporations upon the farmer, grievances which several months ago were pointed out by Bishop Wehrle. There is no question of nationalizing the property of the farmers, by the Non-Partisan League, since it is entirely supported by the farmers themselves. It is to be hoped that the chain of daily and weekly papers that the League is rapidly multiplying will not be made to serve the materialistic propaganda of Socialistic philosophy. Socialists have been exceedingly active in the leadership of the new movement. Since the agitation in favor of the League is in no way confined to North Dakota we may possibly expect similar developments in other States.